

THE
CHRISTIAN
REMEMBRANCER.

JUNE, 1829.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

- ART. I.—1. *An Inquiry concerning the Means and Expedience of proposing and making any Changes in the Canons, Articles, or Liturgy, or in any of the Laws affecting the Interests of the Church of England.* By WILLIAM WINSTANLEY HULL, of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister at Law, late Fellow of Brazennose College, Oxford. J. Parker, Oxford; Rivingtons, London. 8vo. 1828. Price 7s.
- 2.—*Church Reform.* By A CHURCHMAN. London: J. Murray and J. Parker. 1828. 8vo. Price 6s. 6d.

(Continued from page 270.)

HAVING already introduced these publications to our readers, and endeavoured to show that the *liturgical* changes which they advocate are inexpedient and unnecessary, we proceed to the discussion of the remaining topics embraced by the respectable writers before us. Not, indeed, that we have either space or inclination to follow our authors through all the details of their projected amendments: we select rather the most prominent of their schemes, and can honestly assure those, who may wish to peruse the pamphlets on our table, that they will not fail to reap an abundant harvest of amusement and instruction. They will find, it must be confessed, much learning in the Barrister injudiciously applied; and the Churchman's Reform will sometimes startle them by the boldness of his sweeping changes; yet the spirit of conciliation with which they advocate their respective measures will receive, we are sure, unmixed approbation, and their sincere attachment to the Established Church will win the favour of every man who wishes to promote her welfare.

Amongst her most zealous friends we claim the privilege of ranking ourselves. The pages of the *Christian Remembrancer* shall be ever devoted to the fearless maintenance of her righteous cause; and we examine the projects which touch her interests with a feeling approaching to *jealousy*, because we love her. We love her, because

we see in her doctrines, her formularies, and her laws, the great bulwark of Protestantism: and on that head, which would plot her ruin, and on that hand, which would rob her of her endowments, we should be tempted to imprecate the fate of that officious meddler, who paid the forfeit of his life for daring to violate the sanctity of the ark of God! And yet, we would not deny that our Church may need Reform. Laws adapted to the exigencies of one age may become unfit for another. We would not, therefore, condemn all correction as sacrilege; and we are anxious to remove the blemishes, which time, or human infirmity, or vice, may have slowly and silently introduced into our ecclesiastical polity. The *more perfect* we can make our Church, the *more secure* will she be; and the timidity of the coward, who refuses the aid of the physician till all medicine be too late, is equally to be condemned with the rashness of the empiric who *prescribes* his patient into the grave. We would imitate the prudence of the Church of England, whose wisdom it has ever been

To keep the mean between the two extremes of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting variation. For as, on the one side, common experience sheweth, that where a change hath been made of things advisedly established, (no evident necessity so requiring,) sundry inconveniences have therefore ensued; and those many times more and greater than the evils that were intended to be remedied by such change: so, on the other side, . . . it is but reasonable, that, upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigency of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made therein, as to those that are in place of authority should, from time to time, seem either necessary or expedient.*

We gladly adorn our pages with an extract from Mr. Hull, with whom, on this point, we perfectly harmonize in opinion:

It seems fair from history, fair in theory, to infer, that the most perfect Church, in our eyes, at the commencement of this century, might be well improved at the commencement of the next by its then members. How sad are the consequences of that pretension to infallibility, which the Popes still maintain! If we declare at once against all change without inquiry, we pretend to infallibility just as much as the Popish Church. Any needless impediments to inquiry and change are evidence of the same pretension in a less degree. On the other hand, it is idle for individuals in a Church to claim a right to live without rules, and articles, and creeds: it cannot be, even in the civil department. . . . All men should leave to the rulers of their Church all things that are indifferent; and make those regulations their own, and obey them in all cases, wherein such obedience does not offend conscience. When an individual insists upon doing all his conscience requires him to do, then he is becoming a bad subject. All that conscience can possibly require is, that he should not be compelled to do what offends his conscience. Order and good rule would soon be at an end, if conscience were allowed to justify the deeds of any enthusiast; and there might be many a Venner in the streets of London every year.—P. 44.

* The Preface to the Book of Common Prayer.

But the expediency of inquiry, and the necessity of Church reform become still more manifest, from the fact which is thus stated by our Churchman, in the introduction to his work.

The Reformation in this country NEVER WAS COMPLETED. . . . One main branch of the Reformation, for instance, the compilation of a body of ecclesiastical laws, for which measures were taken almost on the first dawn of the light of Protestantism, which for a long succession of years was held in view, and at length almost brought to a conclusion, was broken off by the death of Edward VI. That the work of the Reformation was left incomplete is no matter of surprise, when the circumstances of the times are kept in mind. When we reflect upon the many and various difficulties with which Cramer had to contend, we admire him for doing so much, rather than censure him for not doing more. Admirable indeed were the temper, the judgment, and the caution, with which he steered his course among the rocks, and shoals, and quicksands, which every where surrounded him, through the fierce despotism, the fiery passions, and conceited arrogance of intellect, of Henry the Eighth, and the secularity and avarice, the deadly animosities and complicated intrigues of those, who, after his death, conducted the government of the country. The Reformation, one of the greatest periods of human improvement, was a time of trouble and confusion. . . . Upon the accession of Elizabeth, her object was, as quickly as possible, to restore the national religion to the state in which it was at the death of her brother; and thus to have as little discussion on the subject as possible. . . . Her successor was not less apprehensive of the increasing influence of Puritanism; and the pious, though not always well-judging men, who framed the millenarian petitions, asked so much, that they failed to obtain some things, which might, perhaps, have been advantageously granted to them. . . . At the Savoy Conference, almost immediately after the Restoration, the objections to the Liturgy brought forward by the Presbyterians, and the replies of the advocates of the Church, bore, of course, a strong similarity to those which were respectively adduced at the Conference at Hampton Court. But the excellent and able men who defended the cause of the Church, had in many ways smarted too severely and too RECENTLY, from the temporary triumph of their adversaries, to be well disposed for the work of concession and conciliation.

Another attempt to remove some imperfections in our ecclesiastical institutions, and to supply or complete some things that were wanting, was made immediately after the abdication of James II. and the accession of his daughter and her husband to the throne. On September 13, 1689, a commission was issued by King William to ten Bishops and twenty Divines, to prepare matters to be considered by the Convocation. One subject of this commission was the improvement of ecclesiastical law, and another was the reformation of the ecclesiastical courts. . . . Several of the Bishops, to whom the commission was addressed, were able and learned men; and of the twenty Divines, some were among the most distinguished ornaments of the Church of England; for instance, Stillingfleet, and Patrick, and Sharp, and Beveridge, and Burnet, and Tillotson. The heart-burnings occasioned by the great Rebellion, however, were not yet laid to rest, and the Revolution had just given a fresh impulse to inquiet and hostile party-feelings. Some of the Commissioners named by the King either did not appear, or soon deserted their brethren.* . . . It must be acknowledged, that the alterations suggested by these Commissioners, though dictated by a genuine spirit of conciliation, were greatly too extensive. Much of what they proposed might be adopted with great benefit to the Church. But the spirit of the times was most unfavourable for the work; and the attempt at improvement was altogether abortive.

Thus has the Church of England gone on from the commencement of the reformation of religion until the present time, a period of almost three hundred

* Birch's Life of Tillotson.

years, acknowledging and lamenting her own incompleteness in some important particulars, but prevented by some extraneous circumstances from applying a remedy.—Pp. 4—10.

Unquestionably, this is a strong case made out for inquiry; and he who should “correct and counteract the innovations of time, and bring back some few of our ecclesiastical institutions to their primitive intention and object,” “would contribute much to the honour, and extension, and stability of our apostolical Church of England; would increase not a little the efficiency of her clergy; and consequently would, under the divine blessing, be instrumental in promoting the everlasting welfare of the people committed to their charge.”—(*Church Reform*, p. 19.)

With regard to the *discipline* of the Church, as far as concerns the clergy, that there should be vested in the hands of our Bishops a definite, a cheap, and a prompt method of controlling their conduct, “is a consummation devoutly to be wished.” The absolute necessity of such corrective discipline, no man in his senses can deny. As the law now stands, episcopal control is so beset with difficulties and impediments, so tedious in its process, so uncertain in its issue, and so ruinous in point of expense, that the Bishops are deterred from its use. *Scandalous* and *notoriously profligate* delinquents have thus mocked at the admonitions of their diocesans, and involved them at the same time in most inconvenient costs. Such foul blots are too well known to need any statement in our pages.

All men of the slightest pretension to common sense and proper feeling must concur in thinking that this state of things ought to be remedied without delay. *Church Reform*, p. 32.

But what is the remedy? Our Churchman suggests the appointment of *Courts Ecclesiastical*, almost exactly similar in their constitution and proceedings to *Courts Martial* in the army and navy. A clergyman being charged with some specific offence, the Bishop is to commission some of the most respectable of the sacred profession in the neighbourhood to inquire whether there be any ground for the accusation. Upon their affirmative report, a certain number of clergymen are to constitute a court for the trial of the person accused. They are to be of the chapter of the cathedral. The court is to be held in the chapter-house. The Chancellor of the diocese might, it is thought, fulfil the duties of Judge Advocate; and it is proposed that the Registrar of the diocese should act as public prosecutor. The *finding* of the court is not to be made public until it has been submitted to the Bishop of the Diocese, by whom the sentence, (a fine, in proportion to the amount of the ecclesiastical income of the delinquent, or suspension, or total degradation) should be definitively pronounced. When the charge is established the expenses are to

fall on the delinquent. When it is found to be groundless, the promoters of it must be responsible.

We confess that we are by no means friendly to this proposal of our author. We dislike what wears too much the appearance of a system of *espionage*; and we should infinitely prefer a summary jurisdiction placed in episcopal hands, with an appeal in all cases to the Archbishop, and thence to the King. But the subordinate details of the corrective measure, we do not assume the province of stating. The discipline is loudly called for, and *must* be, sooner or later, adopted.

So, again, the canons of the Church challenge immediate review. The constitutions of Otho and Othobon,—of Boniface, Peccham, and Mepham, would be absolutely *ludicrous*, when applied to the present times, were they not *sorrowful* burdens upon our consciences. The canons of 1603, wanting the sanction of Parliament, do not bind the laity. How far they are obligatory upon the clergy, either in law or in conscience, is by no means clearly ascertained. Archdeacon Sharpe argues that the clergy have a *tacit dispensation* for not following the letter of the canon in all points.

The Canons were framed, he says, [for thus our author quotes him, p. 53] suitably to the particular principles, discipline, and customs, of that age in which they are set forth. The reasons of some injunctions have now ceased. The use and fitness of others now no longer appeareth. And what might be decent then, and pass well, would seem now, after almost a century and a half, through gradual change of customs, strangely antique and unbecoming. Now surely this state of things ought not to be suffered to continue. Surely the ecclesiastical law of the kingdom ought not to be permitted to remain in this state of uncertain obligation, of inextricable entanglement, of obsolescence, and desuetude.

A Board of Commissioners appointed by the Crown might easily concoct a remedy, to be submitted to Convocation, and finally sanctioned by Parliament.

But we hasten from this topic to the consideration of Church Endowments, Church Pluralities, and Church Property, which are respectively weighed in chapters 4, 5, and 10 of the work which occupies the second place at the head of our present article. Already has the trumpet of alarm opened her brazen throat; and, as if to give the lie direct to the fond prophecies of peace and tranquillity for *emancipated* Ireland, the noisy canonizer of Paine has petitioned the Legislature to “repeal the Church Establishment” of that unhappy land! Again, it seems, the agricultural interest hath directed her assaults upon the tithes; and every demagogue in the kingdom, seconded by a rabble rout of farmers, and butchers, and graziers, is looking with ravenous eye upon the property of the Church. The confiscation of her funds is with such men the infallible panacea for our national difficulties. “Abolish the accursed tithe system, and agriculture shall meet with no impediment: the half-ruined farmer shall

easily pay his rent, his taxes, and his poor-rates; and the national debt itself shall be promptly liquidated." Whilst this silly outcry (not the less *mischievous*, however silly,) is sounding in our ears, we doubt the wisdom of mooted the delicate questions which are now immediately before us. We impute no hostile motives to the learned Churchman under review; but all interference with vested rights we totally condemn. What though the projected schemes of our author be entirely "*prospective!*" What though "benefices in the private patronage of individuals" be FOR THE PRESENT exempted from the operation of his measures of reform! What though he confine himself to those livings, "which are mediately or immediately in the gift of the crown, including under the former description all those which are in the gift of Bishops, and of Chapters!" (p. 63.) We reject this compromise. We repudiate this sop. We abominate the invasion of these rights, however limited in its power of mischief; and we hate the principle of plunder and injustice, whatever be the pretext, under which it would win our favour, and however modified be the schemes of its aggression. Thus to meddle with the patronage of the King, (than which none has of late years been more discreetly exercised,) would, in our judgment, greatly hazard the alliance of Church and State. Thus to deprive the Bishops of their patronage, would be a libel upon their sacred bench. Thus to assume the disposal of the secondary sinecures in cathedrals would open the door to universal plunder and indiscriminate rapine.

As far as the *revenues* of the Church are concerned, "her strength," we are persuaded, "is to sit still." To talk of the *riches* of the Church, when all her income would not give more than the hungry pittance of 150*l.* to each of her ministers,—and whilst there are 3589 parochial benefices not exceeding 98*l.* per annum, and more than 1000 livings under 60*l.* per annum, and 422 under 30*l.* is an insult to the understanding of a child.

But this revenue, be it small or great, might be divided in more equal proportions amongst the officiating Clergy: pluralities are scandalous, and ought to be checked: commendams are foul blots in our ecclesiastical polity, and require to be remedied with unflinching hand!

We beg leave to demur to this statement. We deny the expediency of *equalizing* clerical incomes by legislative enactments, and we are persuaded that the hardships here complained of may be more advantageously obviated by the *judicious* exercise of private and public patronage. There are many examples of this wise use of patronage, and we think we see public and private patrons more alive to the responsibility which attaches to them than they were wont to be. We are sure, at the same time, that there must always be poor curates in the Church, and still poorer incumbents, whom it will be easier to pity than to relieve. Yet, they ask not our commiseration. Pious

in their lives,—humble in their views,—prudent in their habits, they have been led to their hallowed office by other affections than the love of gain, or the hope of secular reward. Their joyous hearts are fixed on other riches than man can bestow. “More skilled to raise the wretched than to rise,” they cast no longing look upon the perishable treasures of the world. “Having food and raiment, they are therewith content:”—the luxuries,—yea, and many of the comforts of life, they surrender without a sigh, rich in the anticipation of their heavenly inheritance, and gladdened with the approach of the auspicious day, when, “having turned many to righteousness, they shall shine as the brightness of the firmament for ever and ever.”

The Churchman has much *fine* feeling on the subject of *finer*, from which he holds it to be especially desirable that a Bishop should be entirely relieved :

It is not fitting (he writes) that the attention of a Bishop should be *in any degree* called off from the high spiritual duties of his office, to calculate, with the care of an actuary, the probabilities of the continuance of human life, with a view to personal emolument.—P. 103.

To remedy this grievance it is suggested, that, for the future, all the landed property annexed to any bishopric should be administered by the Chapter of the Cathedral, assisted by the Chancellor of the Diocese. But our space warns us to curtail our remarks ; and therefore we briefly observe that our author's recommendations relative to the making and the custody of terriers is very judicious, though we entertain no inconsiderable doubts about the mode of paying the “Commissioners of Church-Property-Inquiry” by a short sequestration of the profits of the several benefices, as they happen to become void. (P. 192.) The greater proportion of livings could ill afford such a deduction ;—what with the *enormous* stamp duty and other levies made upon new incumbents, they have absolutely *nothing* to spare for any fresh payments in the shape of a tax for any purpose whatever. We could easily draw such a moving picture of the serious inconveniency even now attaching to such recently beneficed clergymen, as would convince our author of the impropriety of his proposition : but we forbear, nor can we afford room for the insertion of our Churchman's observations, excellent and judicious as they generally are, on the important and difficult subject of the commutation of tithes, the undoubted *freeholds* of the clergy, granted by the original possessors of the land, held by a title more ancient than any lay estate in the kingdom, and therefore not to be touched with the mischievous hand of fanciful reformers, but upon the most grave and weighty considerations.

Whilst the Churchman displays a caution amounting almost to fear touching the claims of the Church, Mr. Hull rushes to the other

extreme, and, regardless of the means of accomplishing his projects, writes as follows, with much good sense and great knowledge of human nature, though, we fear, with lamentable disregard of the practicability of his scheme :

Clergymen are most in their places where most business is to be done : and though some of them protest against being secularized, the term is as disagreeable as the notion is mistaken. The closet and the world, the church and the drawing-room, have all the same uses to Clergymen and Laymen, and all, too, the same abuses. Laymen are apt to make up for their own faults by requiring a much greater degree of holiness in the Clergy : there may be some latent Popery in the requisition. It is right to add here, that land-owners would think it a grievance if their tenants were allowed to plead against a fair rent the customary payment of an unfair rent, by the name of a *modus*, in cases where ancestors could not by law have bound their successors, and that reduced rent were confessedly too little for their support in a rank, which, as a body, they are expected to maintain.

Upon inquiry, many changes might be debated usefully. *Full payment of all tithes should be insisted upon ; and each cure should be made a living.* If tithes were fully paid, the surplus so gained might be well applied to Church purposes in many ways, &c. &c.—*Hull's Inquiry*, p. 80.

We would willingly add somewhat upon Church edifices. The subject of Dilapidations, of Parish Churches, and of Parsonage Houses, affords us a tempting topic of discussion, but our limits deny us the satisfaction of mootiing these interesting themes.

We are free to confess that we are much indebted to the authors before us for the able strictures which they have made upon the questions which they investigate. We have differed—we still differ—widely from them in some of their schemes, whilst to others we are anxious to afford the sanction, such as it is, of our hearty concurrence. We sincerely recommend these momentous points to the wisdom of the Episcopal Bench. Reform in some shape must come. It cannot come *too soon* ; and we earnestly hope that the spiritual rulers of our Church will immediately concert some measures for the consummation of so desirable an end. “To my Lords the Bishops,” we say in the language of Bacon,* as quoted by our Churchman, (p. 16) “that it is hard for them to avoid blame, (in the opinion of an indifferent person,) in standing so precisely upon altering nothing : *leges, novis legibus non recreatæ, acescunt* ; laws not refreshed with new laws, wax sour. *Qui mala non permutat, in bonis non perseverat* ; without change of ill, a man cannot continue the good. To take away many abuses supplanteth not good orders, but establisheth them. *Morosa moris retentio, res turbulenta est æque ac novitas.*”†

* Bacon, of Church Controversies.

† We are sorry to find that, in one instance, we have mistaken the views of Mr. Hull ; and we are still more sorry to be obliged to differ, in any instance, from so candid and honest a Churchman. In a letter, which he has addressed to us, he disclaims any objection to the use of creeds *in toto*, though he wishes to confine them to the Communion service only. We take this opportunity of thanking Mr. H. for the obliging offer contained in his communication ; which, from such a man, we duly appreciate.

ART. II.—*An Historical Account of the Thirty-Nine Articles, from the First Promulgation of them in 1553, to their Final Establishment in 1571, with Exact Copies of the Latin and English Manuscripts, and Facsimiles of the Signatures of the Archbishops and Bishops, &c. &c.* By JOHN LAMB, D.D. Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Deighton, Cambridge; Rivingtons, London; Parker, Oxford. 1829. 4to. Price 1l. 5s.

DESPITE the vulgar outcry that the Church is the advocate and patron of ignorance, we have always endeavoured, while affectionately and devotedly maintaining the rights and claims of our ecclesiastical establishment, no less earnestly to defend the necessity of a *suitable* education for all classes. If the plan of the Gower Street University, and the superficial and superfluous accomplishments of the Mechanics' Institutions be the only antithesis to ignorance, then, alas! we must contentedly acquiesce in our own condemnation. But if a steady support of such real information as the leisure of each man will bear, and the profession of each man can improve, may acquit us of the odious charge, we think we may rely on a successful defence. A superficial knowledge of mathematics is equivalent to none; and a superficial knowledge of most other things is more likely to mislead than to benefit. But if this kind of knowledge is *always* something less than equivocal, what must it be when attempted to be driven into the rough understandings of labourers and journeymen! All real knowledge, however, especially professional knowledge, is valuable; and as we have one common profession, Christianity, all knowledge on that subject must be valuable to all; and, therefore, we have always most strenuously opposed religious ignorance, whether silently promoted by those who studiously proclaim it to be compatible with all useful learning, or openly advocated by the well-intentioned but indiscriminate panegyrists of days gone by, when knowledge was scarce, not because it was injurious, but because the means of acquiring it were fewer and less effective.

We have not the slightest hesitation in retorting upon the enemies of the Church the charge which they attempt to fix upon us. Their vain accusation sufficiently brands them with a voluntary and determined ignorance. With all the means of inquiry and knowledge in their power, they care not to acquaint themselves with the nature of a Church which the State still *professes* to be part of the constitution, and which in common justice they are bound to know before they condemn. It is their interest (and diligently do they follow it) to keep others in similar ignorance, that their own may be palliated, and their designs countenanced and executed.

Yet although knowledge on no point is so easy of access as on that of the frame, constitution, creed, and practice of the Established

Church, all which are constantly before the eyes of the world; although no inquiry can be more important than that which leads us to discover the claims of the predominating religion of our country: although such inquiry and such knowledge are absolutely necessary to those who undertake to canvass the subject fairly, either on religious or political grounds: yet how portentous is the ignorance of our ecclesiastical constitution which pervades every class of society! What opinions do we hear in conversation and read in print from men who even profess themselves members of our Church! Baptismal regeneration denied by such persons in the teeth of our Articles, Catechism, and Liturgy! We have even heard it argued that our Church defends Transubstantiation, because the Catechism teaches that the body and blood of Christ are "verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper:" when the very expression, "by the faithful," is a sufficient proof that the Church could mean no such thing as transubstantiation, since, if there were a corporeal metamorphosis, the unfaithful would necessarily be as much partakers as the faithful: to say nothing of the positive affirmation of the Church in her Articles,* and of her definition of a Sacrament in this very Catechism, that it is a SIGN. But it is not only in the current intercourse of society, that this ignorance is found. What deplorable ignorance exists on this subject where it ought to be best understood, even in the Senate of the land, has been witnessed abundantly in the debates of late years; at no time so abundantly as in those on the late disastrous measure. And in another part of our publication we are now displaying the melancholy ignorance of those who have deserted us, and whose arguments have been pronounced unanswerable solely because the nature of our Church has neither been examined nor understood!

If those who charge the Church with promoting ignorance, would themselves acquire a little information on the subjects which they discuss so confidently, it would be advantageous to us and to them. The advantage of the Church is not an argument very likely to weigh with them for good; their own advantage may. We will, therefore, remind them of one of their own favourite maxims, that "knowledge is power:" and, we will add, ignorance is weakness; and however currently hardy assertion may pass for awhile, ultimate and inevitable exposure must cover them with confusion, and incapacitate them from producing any impression through the influence of character and integrity. If the history, discipline, and doctrine of the Church are unknown and misrepresented, it is not because there are not abundant means of information on all, but because it is not

* Articles XXVIII. XXIX.

the inclination or the object of her opponents to divest themselves of that ignorance which they so liberally charge upon her. Dr. Lamb's book leaves them more inexcusable than it has found them, by exhibiting alike the authority by which the Articles were compiled, and leading to their true interpretation through the gradations which leave their completion in the present form.

The publication before us has many claims to public gratitude. It has reprinted some old and very scarce copies of the Articles; brought others out of the obscurity of College shelves, and from the perils common to all monographs; and given a succinct, but well authenticated account of the circumstances in which they severally arose, and the mode in which they received the sanction of authority.

The documents contained in this work, and the objects it professes to obtain, shall be expressed in Dr. Lamb's own words :

Among the many benefits, which Parker conferred upon the Anglican Church, the final settlement of the Articles of Religion is not the least. It is well known that among the valuable manuscripts, which he bequeathed to the College of Corpus Christi Cambridge, of which he had been Master, are two copies of the Articles: one in Latin with the autograph signatures of the Archbishops and Bishops in 1562: the other in English with the autograph signatures of the Archbishop and Bishops in 1571. These manuscripts have long been objects of interest and curiosity. An account has been given of them in Strype, which is materially incorrect; and his account is frequently referred to as authority by writers of our Church History. These circumstances led me to the determination of printing a few copies of these manuscripts, *page, line, and word* exactly corresponding with the originals. I have since been induced to prefix an *Historical Account* of the Articles from their first promulgation by Edward VI. in 1553 to their final establishment by the Act of Elizabeth 1571. And also, in addition to the manuscripts, to reprint the Articles of 1553; distinguishing the parts which were omitted or altered in the Convocation of 1562, and also shewing where additions of Articles or Clauses were made. I have also printed a Facsimile of the edition of Jugg and Cawood of 1563, this being the very book to which the Act of 13 Elizabeth refers. And to complete the collection of editions of the Articles, I have added Day's in Latin of 1571, and Jugg and Cawood's in English of the same year; both of which were edited under the superintendence of Bishop Jewel; and which are now reprinted from the copies formerly belonging to Archbishop Parker, and given by him to the Library of Corpus Christi College.—P. 4.

The author then enters on his historical account, in which there is nothing new, but the events are well selected, and verified by references. One part is curious, as it shows, in confirmation of Mr. Towgood's facts (not his arguments) noticed in our last observations on Schism, that the authority of Convocation was always considered constitutionally necessary in doctrinal cases, even at times when the utmost extent of despotism was exercised by the civil power in the Church. The Articles of 1552, were *never* offered to or approved by the Convocation, yet the government did not hesitate to entitle them, "Articles agreed upon by the Bishoppes and other learned and godly men IN THE LAST CONVOCATION at London;" a falsehood so shameless and so easy of detection, as no consideration

could have induced a man in his senses to promulgate, had not he conceived it the only means whereby his interposition could obtain a shadow of legality.

These Articles, of course, at the accession of Mary, were abrogated. But when Elizabeth ascended the throne, the Reformation was again triumphant. Dr. Lamb narrates the difficulties which this Princess experienced in obtaining a Protestant Convocation, without whom she knew she could not constitutionally authorize Protestant Articles in the National Church. In this part of the History, it is gratifying to find, that the "*laudator temporis acti*" may sometimes be in the wrong. What a contrast, for instance, does the following description of Kitchin, Bishop of Llandaff, present to the steady, consistent Protestantism of modern Prelates!

Camden terms him "*Sedis sue calamitatem.*" He was elected Bishop of Landaff in 1545, and took the following oath: "I, Antony, elect Bishop of Landaff, having now the vail of darkness of the usurped power, authority, and jurisdiction of the See and Bishop of Rome clearly taken away from mine eyes, do utterly testify and declare in my heart, that neither the See nor the Bishop of Rome, nor any foreign Potentate hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, or authority within this realm by God's law, or any just law or means, &c. &c. and that I will resist the same to the utmost of my power." This vail of darkness came over his eyes again upon Mary's accession to the throne. He was one of the commissioners appointed by her to remove the Protestant bishops for "*teaching preaching and setting forth of erroneous doctrines.*" To complete his character we may add one more circumstance. "In 1555 Rawlins White, an honest poor fisherman, was burnt at Cardiff. He was a very ancient man, and was put in prison only because he had put his son to school that he might hear the Bible read by him. After a year's confinement, the Bishop of Landaff condemned him upon Articles to which he answered as a Heretic."—P. 10.

In December, 1559, Parker was appointed to the Primacy. This circumstance soon led to a thorough purification of the Church, and the compilation of our present Articles, which, corrected from Parker's copy by Bishop Jewel, are now the National Confession of Faith.

Dr. Lamb has appended to his treatise a brief and candid disquisition of the history of the celebrated clause which opens the Twentieth Article; and although he can scarcely be said to have determined the question, he has certainly brought forward very fair grounds for the determination, and we, for our own part, are inclined to follow his opinion. With an extract from this, as every way curious, we shall conclude the present notice, premising that, however the passage may have been introduced, it has now received the sanction of the Church; and we think we abundantly proved, in our April Number, that the matter of it is strictly true.

In the preceding account no mention has been made of the disputed clause at the beginning of the twentieth Article as now found in our authorised copies. "*Habet Ecclesia Ritus statuendi jus, et in fidei controversiis auctoritatem.*" "*The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies and Authority in Matters of Faith.*" I shall now proceed to state what I consider to be the real history of this clause.

From the preceding statement and annexed copies it is evident that it was not in the Articles as they passed the Convocation in 1562. For we have before us the manuscript signed by the Archbishops and Bishops, and it appears that no alteration of the Articles took place in the lower house. But this clause is found in the first printed copy after the Convocation of 1562, viz. that of Reginald Wolfe published by Royal authority in 1563. Surely then it can be no difficult matter to ascertain, or at least to form a probable conjecture, by whose means this clause was inserted between the passing of the Articles in Convocation, and their first publication. Let us trace the progress of them during this period. A fair copy, or the copy with the signatures of both houses would be sent to the council board for the approbation of her Majesty, and for the purpose of attaching the great seal, this being necessary according to the Act of submission to give authority to any deed of Convocation. The copy remained in the hands of her Majesty about a twelvemonth, and the disputed clause (there can be little doubt) was added during this period by the Queen, or by the Council at her suggestion.—P. 33.

To the Latin edition of Wolfe, in which the clause first appeared is the following remarkable addition: "*Quibus omnibus Articulis Serenissima Princeps Elizabeth, Dei Gratia Angliæ, Franciæ, et Hiberniæ Regina Fidei Defensor &c. PER SE IPSAM diligenter prius lectis et examinatis, Regium suum assensum præbuit.*" This declaration is not affixed to any other edition.

The clause did not appear in either of the English editions of Jugg and Cawood of the same date; as these would be translated from the copy in the hands of the Archbishop under his directions. It may perhaps be thought that neither the Queen or her Council would take upon themselves to alter Articles approved of by the Convocation, and to publish them thus altered. But there is a curious circumstance connected with the omission of the twenty-ninth Article, "*Impii non manducant corpus Christi in usum Cænæ,*" which throws some light upon the subject. This Article was omitted both in the Latin and English printed copies before 1571 in compliance with the wish or order of Cecil, probably at the suggestion of his royal Mistress. It appears that in a personal conference the Lord Treasurer and the Archbishop had an argument respecting this Article; and that the latter defended it against the objections of the former; this we learn casually from a letter addressed by Parker to Cecil in 1571. He states; "I am advisedly still in my opinion concerning so much as it was alleged for in the Article (alluding to the reference to St. Augustin). And for further truth of the words both he in other places, and Prosper in his sentences out of St. Augustin *senten.* 338 and 339 doth plainly affirm our opinion in this Article to be most true."

Hence we find that Cecil or the Queen did not altogether approve of this Article, and that accordingly it was struck out of the copy submitted to them by Convocation before its publication. Is it then too much to suspect that the addition to the twentieth Article was made by the same party, especially as its matter was so consonant with their opinions?

Archbishop Parker and the Churchmen of his days have been very unjustly accused of the insertion of this clause. In the copy of Articles, which Parker prepared for the Convocation, he added to the thirty-fourth the following sentence: "*Qualibet ecclesia particularis sive nationalis auctoritatem habet instituendi, mutandi, aut abrogandi Cereemonias, aut ritus ecclesiasticos, humani tantum auctoritate institutos, modo omnia ad edificationem fiant.*" And this is all the power, or authority that he considered it right for the Church to claim, or assume. Had the Bishops even approved of the clause, after that it had been prefixed by the twentieth Article in 1563, they would certainly have adopted it in the Convocation of 1571. But it does not appear in the manuscript they signed, or in either the Latin or English copy edited under the superintendence of Bishop Jewel in that year.

In 1637, Archbishop Laud was accused among other matters with having forged this clause. The accusation was clearly unjust. But such a charge

Church, all which are constantly before the eyes of the world; although no inquiry can be more important than that which leads us to discover the claims of the predominating religion of our country: although such inquiry and such knowledge are absolutely necessary to those who undertake to canvass the subject fairly, either on religious or political grounds: yet how portentous is the ignorance of our ecclesiastical constitution which pervades every class of society! What opinions do we hear in conversation and read in print from men who even profess themselves members of our Church! Baptismal regeneration denied by such persons in the teeth of our Articles, Catechism, and Liturgy! We have even heard it argued that our Church defends Transubstantiation, because the Catechism teaches that the body and blood of Christ are "verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper:" when the very expression, "by the faithful," is a sufficient proof that the Church could mean no such thing as transubstantiation, since, if there were a corporeal metamorphosis, the unfaithful would necessarily be as much partakers as the faithful: to say nothing of the positive affirmation of the Church in her Articles,* and of her definition of a Sacrament in this very Catechism, that it is a *Sign*. But it is not only in the current intercourse of society, that this ignorance is found. What deplorable ignorance exists on this subject where it ought to be best understood, even in the Senate of the land, has been witnessed abundantly in the debates of late years; at no time so abundantly as in those on the late disastrous measure. And in another part of our publication we are now displaying the melancholy ignorance of those who have deserted us, and whose arguments have been pronounced unanswerable solely because the nature of our Church has neither been examined nor understood!

If those who charge the Church with promoting ignorance, would themselves acquire a little information on the subjects which they discuss so confidently, it would be advantageous to us and to them. The advantage of the Church is not an argument very likely to weigh with them for good; their own advantage may. We will, therefore, remind them of one of their own favourite maxims, that "knowledge is power:" and, we will add, ignorance is weakness; and however currently hardy assertion may pass for awhile, ultimate and inevitable exposure must cover them with confusion, and incapacitate them from producing any impression through the influence of character and integrity. If the history, discipline, and doctrine of the Church are unknown and misrepresented, it is not because there are not abundant means of information on all, but because it is not

* Articles XXVIII. XXIX.

the inclination or the object of her opponents to divest themselves of that ignorance which they so liberally charge upon her. Dr. Lamb's book leaves them more inexcusable than it has found them, by exhibiting alike the authority by which the Articles were compiled, and leading to their true interpretation through the gradations which leave their completion in the present form.

The publication before us has many claims to public gratitude. It has reprinted some old and very scarce copies of the Articles; brought others out of the obscurity of College shelves, and from the perils common to all monographs; and given a succinct, but well authenticated account of the circumstances in which they severally arose, and the mode in which they received the sanction of authority.

The documents contained in this work, and the objects it professes to obtain, shall be expressed in Dr. Lamb's own words:

Among the many benefits, which Parker conferred upon the Anglican Church, the final settlement of the Articles of Religion is not the least. It is well known that among the valuable manuscripts, which he bequeathed to the College of Corpus Christi Cambridge, of which he had been Master, are two copies of the Articles: one in Latin with the autograph signatures of the Archbishops and Bishops in 1562: the other in English with the autograph signatures of the Archbishop and Bishops in 1571. These manuscripts have long been objects of interest and curiosity. An account has been given of them in Strype, which is materially incorrect; and his account is frequently referred to as authority by writers of our Church History. These circumstances led me to the determination of printing a few copies of these manuscripts, *page, line, and word* exactly corresponding with the originals. I have since been induced to prefix an *Historical Account* of the Articles from their first promulgation by Edward VI. in 1553 to their final establishment by the Act of Elizabeth 1571. And also, in addition to the manuscripts, to reprint the Articles of 1553; distinguishing the parts which were omitted or altered in the Convocation of 1562, and also shewing where additions of Articles or Clauses were made. I have also printed a Facsimile of the edition of Jugg and Cawood of 1563, this being the very book to which the Act of 13 Elizabeth refers. And to complete the collection of editions of the Articles, I have added Day's in Latin of 1571, and Jugg and Cawood's in English of the same year; both of which were edited under the superintendence of Bishop Jewel; and which are now reprinted from the copies formerly belonging to Archbishop Parker, and given by him to the Library of Corpus Christi College.—P. 4.

The author then enters on his historical account, in which there is nothing new, but the events are well selected, and verified by references. One part is curious, as it shows, in confirmation of Mr. Towgood's facts (not his arguments) noticed in our last observations on Schism, that the authority of Convocation was always considered constitutionally necessary in doctrinal cases, even at times when the utmost extent of despotism was exercised by the civil power in the Church. The Articles of 1552, were *never* offered to or approved by the Convocation, yet the government did not hesitate to entitle them, "Articles agreed upon by the Bishoppes and other learned and godly men IN THE LAST CONVOCATION at London;" a falsehood so shameless and so easy of detection, as no consideration

could have induced a man in his senses to promulgate, had not he conceived it the only means whereby his interposition could obtain a shadow of legality.

These Articles, of course, at the accession of Mary, were abrogated. But when Elizabeth ascended the throne, the Reformation was again triumphant. Dr. Lamb narrates the difficulties which this Princess experienced in obtaining a Protestant Convocation, without whom she knew she could not constitutionally authorize Protestant Articles in the National Church. In this part of the History, it is gratifying to find, that the "*laudator temporis acti*" may sometimes be in the wrong. What a contrast, for instance, does the following description of Kitchin, Bishop of Llandaff, present to the steady, consistent Protestantism of modern Prelates!

Camden terms him "*Sedis suæ calamitatem.*" He was elected Bishop of Landaff in 1545, and took the following oath: "I, Antony, elect Bishop of Landaff, having now the vail of darkness of the usurped power, authority, and jurisdiction of the See and Bishop of Rome clearly taken away from mine eyes, do utterly testify and declare in my heart, that neither the See nor the Bishop of Rome, nor any foreign Potentate hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, or authority within this realm by God's law, or any just law or means, &c. &c. and that I will resist the same to the utmost of my power." This vail of darkness came over his eyes again upon Mary's accession to the throne. He was one of the commissioners appointed by her to remove the Protestant bishops for "*teaching preaching and setting forth of erroneous doctrines.*" To complete his character we may add one more circumstance. "In 1555 Rawlins White, an honest poor fisherman, was burnt at Cardiff. He was a very ancient man, and was put in prison only because he had put his son to school that he might hear the Bible read by him. After a year's confinement, the Bishop of Landaff condemned him upon Articles to which he answered as a Heretic."—P. 10.

In December, 1559, Parker was appointed to the Primacy. This circumstance soon led to a thorough purification of the Church, and the compilation of our present Articles, which, corrected from Parker's copy by Bishop Jewel, are now the National Confession of Faith.

Dr. Lamb has appended to his treatise a brief and candid disquisition of the history of the celebrated clause which opens the Twentieth Article; and although he can scarcely be said to have determined the question, he has certainly brought forward very fair grounds for the determination, and we, for our own part, are inclined to follow his opinion. With an extract from this, as every way curious, we shall conclude the present notice, premising that, however the passage may have been introduced, it has now received the sanction of the Church; and we think we abundantly proved, in our April Number, that the matter of it is strictly true.

In the preceding account no mention has been made of the disputed clause at the beginning of the twentieth Article as now found in our authorised copies. "*Habet Ecclesia Ritus statuendi jus, et in fidei controversiis auctoritatem.*" "*The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies and Authority in Matters of Faith.*" I shall now proceed to state what I consider to be the real history of this clause.

From the preceding statement and annexed copies it is evident that it was not in the Articles as they passed the Convocation in 1562. For we have before us the manuscript signed by the Archbishops and Bishops, and it appears that no alteration of the Articles took place in the lower house. But this clause is found in the first printed copy after the Convocation of 1562, viz. that of Reginald Wolfe published by Royal authority in 1563. Surely then it can be no difficult matter to ascertain, or at least to form a probable conjecture, by whose means this clause was inserted between the passing of the Articles in Convocation, and their first publication. Let us trace the progress of them during this period. A fair copy, or the copy with the signatures of both houses would be sent to the council board for the approbation of her Majesty, and for the purpose of attaching the great seal, this being necessary according to the Act of submission to give authority to any deed of Convocation. The copy remained in the hands of her Majesty about a twelvemonth, and the disputed clause (there can be little doubt) was added during this period by the Queen, or by the Council at her suggestion.—P. 33.

To the Latin edition of Wolfe, in which the clause first appeared is the following remarkable addition: "*Quibus omnibus Articulis Serenissima Princeps Elizabeth, Dei Gratia Angliæ, Franciæ, et Hiberniæ Regina Fidei Defensor &c. PER SEIPSAM diligenter prius lectis et examinatis, Regium suum assensum præbuit.*" This declaration is not affixed to any other edition.

The clause did not appear in either of the English editions of Jugg and Cawood of the same date; as these would be translated from the copy in the hands of the Archbishop under his directions. It may perhaps be thought that neither the Queen or her Council would take upon themselves to alter Articles approved of by the Convocation, and to publish them thus altered. But there is a curious circumstance connected with the omission of the twenty-ninth Article, "*Impii non manducant corpus Christi in usum Cænæ,*" which throws some light upon the subject. This Article was omitted both in the Latin and English printed copies before 1571 in compliance with the wish or order of Cecil, probably at the suggestion of his royal Mistress. It appears that in a personal conference the Lord Treasurer and the Archbishop had an argument respecting this Article; and that the latter defended it against the objections of the former; this we learn casually from a letter addressed by Parker to Cecil in 1571. He states; "I am advisedly still in my opinion concerning so much as it was alleged for in the Article (alluding to the reference to St. Augustin). And for further truth of the words both he in other places, and Prosper in his sentences out of St. Augustin *senten.* 338 and 339 doth plainly affirm our opinion in this Article to be most true."

Hence we find that Cecil or the Queen did not altogether approve of this Article, and that accordingly it was struck out of the copy submitted to them by Convocation before its publication. Is it then too much to suspect that the addition to the twentieth Article was made by the same party, especially as its matter was so consonant with their opinions?

Archbishop Parker and the Churchmen of his days have been very unjustly accused of the insertion of this clause. In the copy of Articles, which Parker prepared for the Convocation, he added to the thirty-fourth the following sentence: "*Qualibet ecclesia particularis sive nationalis auctoritatem habet instituendi, mutandi, aut abrogandi Cereemonias, aut ritus ecclesiasticos, humanæ tantum auctoritate institutos, modo omnia ad edificationem fiant.*" And this is all the power, or authority that he considered it right for the Church to claim, or assume. Had the Bishops even approved of the clause, after that it had been prefixed by the twentieth Article in 1563, they would certainly have adopted it in the Convocation of 1571. But it does not appear in the manuscript they signed, or in either the Latin or English copy edited under the superintendence of Bishop Jewel in that year.

In 1637, Archbishop Laud was accused among other matters with having forged this clause. The accusation was clearly unjust. But such a charge

being brought against him shews, that before his time it was not *generally* found in the authorized copies of the Articles.—Pp. 34, 35.

The following are the simple facts respecting it :

IT IS NOT FOUND :

1. In the Latin Manuscript signed by the Archbishops and Bishops in the Convocation of 1562.
2. In the English editions of Jugg and Cawood of 1563.
3. In the English Manuscript signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops in the Convocation of 1571.
4. In the Latin edition of Day published under the direction of Bishop Jewel in 1571.
5. In the English edition of Jugg and Cawood published under the direction of Bishop Jewel in 1571.

IT IS FOUND :

1. In the Latin edition of Wolfe of 1563.
2. In one [two ?] of the later editions of Jugg and Cawood of 1571.
3. Occasionally in subsequent editions until the time of Archbishop Laud, when it was inserted in all the authorized copies.—Pp. 36, 37.

We sincerely thank Dr. Lamb for his book. It is but justice to him and to the public to state, that it is one of the most beautiful specimens of typography which the Cambridge press has sent forth : and the fac-similes are executed with great fidelity and exactness.

ART. III.—*A Paraphrastic Translation of the Apostolical Epistles. With Notes.* By PHILIP NICHOLAS SHUTTLEWORTH, D.D. Warden of New College, Oxford, and Rector of Foxley, Wilts. Oxford : Parker. London : Rivingtons. 1829. pp. 555. Price 12s.

A VARIETY of difficulties, arising from different causes, is acknowledged, on all hands, to attend the due apprehension of the writings of the Apostles. In order to the *critical* study of them, the scholar must bring with him, not only a close and rivetted attention, but an acquaintance with the sacred and profane history of the times in which they were composed, a familiarity with the customs, the habits, and the prejudices of the persons to whom they were addressed, an insight into the circumstances in which they originated, and the errors which they were intended to correct, and a practical knowledge of the language in which they were originally written. Such, indeed, are the requisite attainments for the perusal of any ancient writings whatsoever, and more particularly of those which involve abstruse philosophical inquiries, and polemical disputations. Of this character are the Apostolical Epistles, and especially those of St. Paul, in which there is a depth of close and profound reasoning, which even, at the period when they were written, and among those for whose instruction they were designed, would not be immediately appreciated by the average understandings of mankind. Add to this, that the points under discussion are frequently the transcendental mysteries of God's

providence, in which the inspired writer, perfectly familiarized with these profound topics, glances from one argument to another, with a fluent rapidity of apprehension, with which his most highly gifted reader cannot always keep pace. No wonder, then, that under the disadvantages of a strictly literal translation; (and it is obvious, that an *authorised* translation must necessarily be strictly literal, that no bias or prejudice of the translators may interfere with the undoubted declarations of the Word of God,) the more uninformed and general reader may fall short of the right understanding of some of those important doctrines, which are explained and elucidated in these sacred documents.

To obviate this defect,—to supply a translation sufficiently close to the original to convey an adequate idea of the manner of the sacred penmen, and, at the same time, sufficiently diffuse to portray the full scope of the argument, is the object of the volume before us. This object has been attained by developing those minute, but necessary links of reasoning, which are often cursorily glanced at by the writers themselves; by filling up those implied inferences, which escape the observation of the less accurate inquirer; and by supplying connecting particles, modernizing idiomatic expressions, explaining obsolete allusions, and providing such other helps and illustrations, as may promote that readiness of perception, which is necessary to digest the full import of the truth, which the Apostles intended to establish. We do not hesitate to say, that Dr. Shuttleworth has rendered an essential service to Christianity, by the judicious, comprehensive, and popular paraphrase, which he has thus effected. By saving his readers the labour of continuous thought, which renders the perusal of the Epistles to the casual inquirer an irksome, and sometimes an insuperable task, he has paved the way to the more wide diffusion of a religious knowledge among all classes of the community. This is peculiarly an age of inquiry; and while the various branches of human knowledge are simplified to the capacities of every understanding, it cannot be a less profitable occupation to place within the reach of all, that knowledge which alone can make men wise unto salvation.

We deem it unnecessary to make an extract from the paraphrase itself; and of the notes, it will be sufficient to remark, that they contain a fund of useful information, judiciously subjoined in illustration of such topics as would not admit of a paraphrastic exposition. At the close of most of the Epistles, however, a brief notice is added of the principal topics therein discussed, of the more immediate purposes of instruction for which they are now available, and of those difficulties in point of doctrine, such as the reconciliation of St. Paul and St. James on the subject of faith, which have been the fertile source of polemic discussion in all ages of the Gospel. To the

Epistle to the Hebrews is annexed a vindication of the great Apostle of the Gentiles from the charge of *insincerity*; and, by way of conclusion to the whole, some remarks are appended on the evidence afforded by the Epistles, taken collectively, to the general truth of the Gospel. From these we shall make a few selections.

The following statement of the doctrines maintained in the Epistle to the Romans forms a good foundation for the study of that importantly argumentative writing:—

1. That all men are sinners in the sight of God, and can only attain to salvation by the aid of a dispensation of imputed righteousness, and not of personal merit.

2. That the criminality of mankind is the consequence of their disobedience to an acknowledged law of righteousness, either natural or revealed.

3. That the spiritual condemnation of the heathen world is the result of their violation of the sanctions of natural religion.

4. That the guilt of the Jews was the effect of their transgressions against the enactments of the Mosaic law.

5. That in our present fallen and degraded condition, which is the consequence of the sin of our first parents, the suggestions and desires of our carnal nature are in a constant state of warfare with our purest spiritual aspirations, and our better knowledge.

6. That, as it was the express object of our Saviour's mission to obliterate the effects of Adam's transgression, and to reconcile us to God by a satisfactory expiation for sin, it is obviously the duty of every Christian, to emancipate himself by every means in his power from the dominion of his carnal and impure appetites, invoking for that purpose the strengthening aid of the Holy Spirit, and trusting to the imputed righteousness of Christ for his final justification.

7. That God's election of the Jewish nation was of a temporal character only: the spiritual and real election being confined exclusively to such individuals as should subsequently have approved themselves to him by their piety and obedience.

8. That the national election of the Jews, having been an act of gratuitous favour, and designed for a specific object, without reference to any claim of merit on their part, might be, and was, justly withdrawn when the arrangements of Providence so required it.

9. That the admission of the Gentiles into the Gospel covenant implied no loss of spiritual privileges to the believing Jews, but merely the impartial diffusion of God's favour to all nations without distinction, whether Jew or Gentile.

10. That, as the whole of the Israelitish nation was not in reality God's Israel, but the obedient only deserved that appellation; so in the Christian world it is not every one bearing the denomination of Christian, but the pure in heart, and the perseveringly righteous only, who can hope to attain to the blessings resulting from Christ's atonement.

11. That a life of unblemished holiness, of perfect obedience, and of implicit reliance upon God's faithfulness, is absolutely required of every person whatever looking for salvation through the merits of our Redeemer.

Such are the principles *undoubtedly* inculcated in this beautiful Epistle. Whether or not they are compatible with what is usually termed the Calvinistic theory may be matter of opinion, according to the peculiar views and impressions of individuals. Certain it is, that no religious scheme can be pronounced to be that of St. Paul, which is irreconcilable with the admission of the foregoing propositions.—Pp. 72, 73.

On the subject of superstitious mortifications we read as follows, under the Epistle to the Galatians:—

If it be urged that our Saviour himself recommends one species of mortification, namely, fasting, as a religious duty, and himself set the example of it, the answer is obvious; that as a means of piety, as a corrective of the petulance produced by prosperity or health, it may be, and is, highly profitable: the real mistake is, when it is relied upon as actually meritorious, and as a substitute for that expiation for sin, which can be obtained through Christ's blood alone. The various forms under which this very natural but pernicious delusion has shown itself in different ages, according to the circumstances of each respective period, is matter of curious but melancholy observation. To the converted Jew and the Judaizing Gentile of the primitive Church it suggested an anxiety to return to the vexatious Levitical bondage from which they had been recently emancipated, and to adopt an heterogeneous and ill-assorted creed, in which the practice of circumcision and other unprofitable ceremonies was considered as a concurrent means of justification with the atonement of Christ itself. A few centuries afterwards it peopled the Egyptian deserts with ascetics, who, having originally retired thither for purposes of general mortification of the body, finally set the example, which was so eagerly followed in other countries, of the most fantastic and capriciously diversified modes of self-torment. It introduced the unscriptural doctrine of purgatory into the Eastern and Western Churches, and gave rise to the institution of the various monastic orders, and with them to a state of spiritual bondage, far exceeding that against which St. Paul so eloquently declaims in the Epistle now before us. To trace it through its infinite diversity of shapes would be endless; perhaps, in fact, few piously disposed persons exist who have not at some period of their lives felt a tendency to this delusion, from which they have finally escaped only by fixing their attention upon that one great basis of all scriptural truth, "Christ crucified," which, as it affords the only solid foundation for a believer's hope, so it is the great practical security for a holy and pure life. If the Protestant communities have been less disfigured by these gloomy superstitions than the Church of Rome, it is because their knowledge of the sacred writings is greater; without the continual and salutary corrective afforded by which, no goodness of intention, no degree of piety, however sincere, could have preserved them from the same pitiable degradation.—Pp. 237, 238.

In the concluding remarks, after some observations on the sincerity and earnestness of the several Apostolic writers, the identity of their doctrines, and the necessity of some such supplementary writings as the Epistles, in order to a complete apprehension of the Gospel scheme, in all its different bearings, Dr. S. proceeds to calculate the advantage arising from the contemplation of this important subject from different points of view:—

Had, for instance, the Epistles of one only of our Lord's disciples descended to us, vast as would have been the value which would have attached to them, still they could not have completely effected that purpose which has been so fully accomplished by the diversified compositions which we actually possess. Every individual brings with him to the profound discussions of theology, if not the reality, at least the suspicion, of a bias. And even if we consider such a suspicion in the case of an inspired teacher to be out of the question, still we must at all events admit that the peculiar circumstances under which he may have been placed with respect to his own immediate converts may occasionally have made it imperative upon him *from principle* to dwell more particularly upon some single and partial view of the theory of revelation, to the comparative neglect, if not to the actual exclusion, of others not less intrinsically important. In addition therefore to the most unblemished integrity in the writer, it requires the collision, not merely of various individual feelings and predispositions, but that also of contingent external events, operating severally upon several parties, to call forth the complete discussion in all its parts of so intricate

and extensive a system of belief as that of the Christian revelation, and to secure the adequate transmission of a scheme thus minute and comprehensive for the edification of aftertimes. And such is precisely the advantage which has accrued to religion both in speculation and practice, from that dissimilar mode of discussing the same really identical and harmonious doctrine which characterizes the Apostolical Epistles. The very different position of Paul with respect to his own peculiar converts, from that occupied by James, Peter, John, and Jude, with reference to theirs, made it to a certain degree incumbent upon him to consider the Christian dispensation from a position directly opposite to that from which they were disposed to regard it. Having been commissioned to undertake the conversion of the *Gentile* world, he must necessarily have laid it down as the foremost duty of his office to establish, in the first place, solidly and substantially, the foundation of *faith* in the Jehovah of the old, and in the crucified Saviour of the new, covenant; and, having secured that great elementary principle, then, as an obvious consequence, to erect upon it the superstructure of Christian holiness and of a good life. And according to this consistent view of the subject, we find him uniformly looking forward prospectively through the whole system, from its first commencing germ to its final and complete development. The four last-mentioned apostles, on the contrary, having to deal almost exclusively with Jews, found many of the primary dogmas of the religion which they had to inculcate already in great measure assented to as articles of faith. To them therefore the task of elementary initiation was comparatively easy. It was not the doctrine of a Messiah which they had to originate, but that the crucified Son of Mary was *the* Messiah, whose advent had been impatiently expected: and in announcing the covenant of divine mercy as proffered to all mankind, they were only enlarging the operation, and refining the principle, of that covenant already acknowledged to subsist between the Almighty and the Jewish nation. The errors therefore which *they* had to combat, and to guard against, were of an entirely different character from those which called forth the occasional abjurations of St. Paul.—Pp. 548, 550.

One more extract, and we have done:—

The uniform tone of reverential awe in which the person of our blessed Redeemer is alluded to throughout the Apostolical Epistles, is another circumstance which those persons who are disposed to object to the doctrine of his divine nature would do well seriously to consider. That St. Paul, who had known him only through the medium of the most stupendous preternatural events, should ever be found to speak of that tremendous Being with the deepest solemnity might naturally be expected. But with regard to the other apostles this consequence seems somewhat less obvious. We all know the equalizing tendency of familiarity in domestic intercourse between persons of the most dissimilar rank and condition of life. But the intimacy of friendship to which the disciples of our Lord were admitted for so long a period, appears not for a moment to have trenchanted upon their reverential adoration of him as an immediate emanation of the eternal Godhead. Above all, we find that sentiment most strongly marked, where perhaps we should least be prepared to look for it, in the writings of the beloved disciple St. John. The unequivocal assertions of our blessed Saviour's divinity contained in his Epistles and in his Gospel are justly considered as affording some of the strongest scriptural proofs of that important doctrine. But that such an impression should have taken complete hold of a mind which had been permitted to trace the object of its reverence through the humble incidents and detail of private life, can be accounted for only upon the supposition that the evidence confirmatory of that impression was of too decided a character to be shaken by even that most critical and perilous test. Certain it is that no misgivings or interventions of doubt upon this subject ever seem for one instant to suggest themselves to that apostle's mind. It has accordingly been well remarked, in reply to those impugnors of our Redeemer's divinity, who assert that this doctrine is of comparatively recent origin, and was

unknown to the primitive Church, that, on the contrary, the heresy which stood most conspicuous in the age of the apostles was that which denied, not his *divine*, but his *human*, nature; and that, so far from being called upon to prove him to be very *God*, (a point universally acknowledged,) the great difficulty seems to have been to persuade the first polluters of the Christian faith, that he was also, really and actually, very *Man*. It was not, until the lapse of time had subdued by distance the astounding effect produced by his miraculous career upon earth, that human audacity dared to attempt to lower him to the scale of a merely mortal teacher, or even to that of the foremost and most glorious of God's created beings.—Pp. 552, 553.

Here, then, we bid our author heartily farewell!

LITERARY REPORT.

An Address to Young Persons after Confirmation. London: Rivingtons, 1829. 12mo. Pp. 88. Price 1s. 6d.

WE sincerely hope to see this useful and excellent little tract, by the Bishop of Barbados, upon the revised list of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. It contains a series of rules for the observation of the youthful Christian, in order to the punctual fulfilment of his baptismal covenant. Each rule is briefly stated, and followed by appropriate exhortations; with scriptural references in the margin, and foot notes including prayers and citations from the old divines. The rules themselves are twelve in number, as follow:

1. *Pray fervently morning and evening.*
2. *In the midst of worldly occupation think upon God.*
3. *Read a portion of Holy Scripture daily.*
4. *Remember your duty to your neighbour.*
5. *Be careful of your time.*
6. *Shun idleness.*
7. *Delay not the work of religion.*
8. *Accustom yourself to private meditation.*
9. *Be cautious with whom you associate.*
10. *Fear not the ridicule of the infidel or the scorner.*
11. *Beware of the first transgression.*
12. *Keep the Sabbath holy.*

At the end are appended a form of prayer and meditation for the morning, afternoon, and evening, from the Countess of Moreton's "Daily Exercise;" and a prayer from Bishop Cosin, to be used on the anniversary of our baptism.

The Divine Origin of Christianity, deduced from some of those Evidences which are not founded on the authenticity of Scripture. By JOHN SHEPPARD, author of "*Thoughts on Private Devotion*," &c. 2 Vols. London: Whittaker, Ave Maria Lane. 1829. Pp. xlviii. 358, 383. Price 14s.

THE object of this work is thus stated by the Author himself:—

"My primary aim is to show, that even if the New Testament had been unhappily destroyed, or its genuineness were not ascertainable,—yet, provided the primitive spirit of the religion could be learnt from the writings of early believers, and those *indirect* proofs collected of its rise and progress, and their causes, which now exist, we ought not to reject it, but to judge that it came from God."—*Pref.* p. 23.

In order to effect this object, Mr. Sheppard undertakes to establish two propositions; one of which is prefixed to the first chapter, and the other to the remainder of the work.

"I.—Before studying either the miraculous or prophetic proof of Christianity, or the written accounts of its progress, whether by friends or enemies,—there may be enough known, from a view of its distinctive character,—of its actual effects,—of its continued and prospective spirit and tendency,—and of its acknowledged commencement,—to yield a complex presumption that it is 'not of men, but of God.'

"II.—There are statements concerning Christianity, (and other coeval religions,)—in extant Jewish and heathen writers;—

in citations from lost works of its adversaries;—in notices of current oral objections to it;—in public appeals as to public facts by early Christian apologists;—in details by Christian writers of events, the general truth of which is amply confirmed by their opponents;—together with implications in the silence of some Jews and heathens, and in the conduct of others; which concur to furnish very strong additional grounds for believing its supernatural origin."

We had intended to have presented our readers with an analytical review of this work; but our limits would scarcely permit us to do it the justice it deserves. In its perusal they will find considerable information; and the Author has exhibited great argumentative powers, and great depth of research, in the treatment of his subject. His style is peculiar, and sometimes harsh; and some of his opinions may probably be questioned; but we do not hesitate to pronounce his publication at once useful, interesting, and instructive.

Ἡ ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. *Novum Testamentum Græce. Ex recensione Jo. Jac. Griesbachii, cum selecta Lectionum varietate.* Londini: Rivingtons. 1829. 24mo. pp. xxiv. 525. 7s.

A NEAT and accurate edition of the Greek Testament. Prefixed are the preface to the last edition of Griesbach, with the third section of his prolegomena, relating to the plan which he pursued, and the aids he employed in forming his judgment of the Text; and a judicious selection of various readings are printed at the foot of the page. We could have wished that the volume had been printed in a bolder type, and in a larger size; at the same time that we are abundantly satisfied with the care and attention which has evidently been given to correctness in the typography.

Miscellaneous Sermons; preached in the Parish Church of Cheltenham. By the Rev. FRANCIS CLOSE, A. M. Perpetual Curate. London: Hatchard. 1829. 8vo. Pp. xx. 480. 12s.

The Book of Genesis considered and illustrated, in a series of Historical Discourses; preached in the Church of the Holy Trinity, Cheltenham. By the Rev. FRANCIS CLOSE, A. M. Perpetual Curate of Cheltenham. London: Hatchard and Seeley. 1828. 12mo. Pp. xxi. 334. 5s.

As the latter volume has passed into a second edition, published in a cheap form for the purpose of a wider circulation, we had expected something above mediocrity in the composition of these discourses, either in a literary or a theological point of view. This expectation has certainly not been realized. There is a want of distinctness also in some of the Author's positions, which leads us to suspect the soundness of his views upon some doctrinal subjects. According to our notion of pulpit instruction, the doctrines of the Gospel should be placed in the most clear and conspicuous light; for without a just conception of the nature of his faith, the practice of a Christian is only founded in the sand, and his principles of exertion will be unstable, wavering, and insecure. From the two volumes before us we have been unable to perceive the precise tenets of Mr. Close's creed; and we must add, that his practical exhortations are not marked with any very forcible appeals, or searching application.

Sermons for Servants. By WILLIAM DOWNES WILLIS, M. A. Vicar of Kirkby in Cleveland, &c. London: Rivingtons. 1829. Pp. viii. 252. 6s.

HERE is another little work well worthy the attention of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The duties of servants are enforced upon religious principles, and in a plain, familiar, and pleasing style, well adapted to the class of persons for whose benefit the publication is immediately designed. Trusting to its speedy adoption in most families, we deem it sufficient to subjoin the table of contents.

Sermon I. On Obedience. II. On Temptation. III. On Fidelity. IV. On Sobriety. V. On Truth. VI. On the Government of the Tongue. VII. On

Personal Purity. VIII. On the Love of Change. IX. On the Fear of God.

It should not be forgotten, by the way, that the profits of the sale will be devoted to a charitable purpose.

He is Risen: an *Easter Offering*. Incribed, by permission, to the *Governors and Masters of Christ's Hospital*. London: Sherwood, &c. 1829. 8vo. pp. 16. 1s.

THIS little Poem originated in the words, "He is Risen," worn, at Easter, on the breasts of the boys of Christ's Hospital. It is a grateful tribute to the author to the governors of that admirable institution for his own education, and that of his children, received under their care. The feelings expressed in it evince a mind impressed with a sober, yet fervent, sense of religion; and the language in which they are conveyed, is a sufficient proof that he, the author, has not neglected to improve the early instructions which he received in the royal foundation of Edward VI. As a specimen, we subjoin the opening lines:

We ask not Who?—For every glowing heart,
That swells with Christian triumph, bears impressed
The HEAVENLY CONQUEROR's Name, and joyful owns
The WORLD'S DELIVERER!..... Yes, it is HE,
Whom martyr'd Stephen's disincumber'd eye
Saw, ere it closed, through Heaven's unfolding doors
Enthroned in glory. He it is, whose voice,
Heard in appalling thunder, check'd the rage
Of Saul's intemperate zeal; and instant won
A willing convert's faith. 'Tis He who gave
The test of sense by doubting Thomas claim'd,
Conviction palpable; with mild reproof
Compelling him to own HIS LORD! HIS GOD!

The Repertorium Theologicum; or, a Critical Record of Theological Literature. Edited by the Rev. D. G. WAIT, LL.D. &c. Part I. May, 1829. To be continued every two months. London: Hearn. 8vo. 5s.

WE have here the first number of a new periodical, which promises to be of great use both to the student in divinity and the matured divine. Its principal feature seems to be the introduction of foreign theology to the English reader, divested of those fanciful speculations and conceited rationalism, which is the bane of the German theological literature. The plan also includes analyses of large commentaries, papers on ecclesiastical history, antiquities, the state of the Sacred Text, scriptural chronology, &c.; in fact, whatever may tend to facilitate the study of the Holy Scriptures, or add to the stores of critical, philological, or exegetical theology. In the present Number, we have extracts or contributions from G. H. and E. F. K. Rosenmüller, D. Gröning, J. H. Mayr, L. J. C. Justi, and W. Gesenius, besides two interesting papers by the Editor, and an unfinished article on the religion of the Druses. We would especially direct attention to Arts. 2, 4, 5, and 7.

The Life of Archbishop Cranmer. By J. A. SARGANT. London: Hunt & Co. 1829. 12mo. pp. viii. 288. 6s. 6d.

MR. TODD's forthcoming biography of this celebrated Prelate will, in all probability, afford us an opportunity of presenting our readers with an analysis of his Life, which in the present times cannot fail of awakening reflections of the most powerful interest. The little work before us modestly professes to be written with a view to the improvement and gratification of the rising generation and the simpler walks of life. To such we cordially recommend it; adding, at the same time, that it may also be perused with advantage by many of riper years, and more advanced attainments.

IN THE PRESS.

The Rev. W. Trollope will publish, in a few days, two Sermons on *Confirmation*.

PREPARING FOR PUBLICATION.

"*Pastoralia*." By the Rev. Henry Thompson, M.A. of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Curate of Wrington, Somerset: Author of "*Davidica*."

SERMON ON THE TRINITY.

[COMPILED.]

1 JOHN V. 7.

There are Three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these Three are One.

THE feast observed by our Church at this season is instituted in honour of the ever-blessed Trinity. The solemn festivals, which, in the foregoing part of our annual service, have presented to our consideration the mysterious work of man's redemption, and the several steps taken to accomplish it, naturally lead us up to, and at last conclude with that of the present day. The incarnation and nativity, the passion and resurrection, of the blessed Jesus, demonstrate how great things the *Son* of God has condescended to do for us:—the miraculous powers with which the first disciples were endued, and the sanctifying graces with which all the faithful are assisted, prove how great and how necessary a part the *Holy Spirit* bore in this work, both in publishing the salvation of the world, and in rendering it effectual:—and they all agree in representing to us the inestimable love of the *Father*, by whom the *Son* was sent, and the Spirit so wonderfully and so plentifully shed abroad. Most justly, therefore, after such informations of the fitness of this subject for our wonder and adoration, does our Church this day call upon us to celebrate the mystery of those *three* persons in the *unity* of the Godhead, each of whom so kindly and so largely contributed to this stupendous and united act of mercy, upon which the whole of all our hopes and happiness depends.

The doctrine of the Trinity may be properly called the fundamental doctrine of the Christian Church. It is a doctrine, without the declaration of which no minister has authority to baptize; and without the acknowledgment of which, on the part of himself by his sureties, no person can be baptized. It is a doctrine, without the declaration of which the Lord's Supper cannot be administered or received. It is a doctrine, which has nevertheless been disputed and attacked by the enemies of our holy religion, more than any other of the articles of our belief. But notwithstanding all the objections which have been repeatedly urged against it, it continues to be professed and maintained by men of the most comprehensive minds, and the most exact and accurate knowledge of the Scriptures.

Indeed, every one, of unprejudiced mind, and with such an acquaintance with the Bible as the most unlearned of us ought to possess, must be convinced of the truth of this doctrine. Though it is not, perhaps, positively stated and expressed by words in Scripture, the verse of St. John, which the text exhibits, being of uncertain authenticity, yet every one that opens the pages of divine revelation must admit that it is the spirit in which the Scriptures are written. From the beginning to the end of the Bible, in the Old Testament as well as in the New, in all the instructions and knowledge which they convey, allusions to the doctrine are constantly made. But in the New Testament particularly the doctrine is clearly, and almost expressly, revealed. When the incarnation of our Lord was announced, those memorable words of the angel to Mary plainly point out the Trinity:—

"The *Holy Ghost* shall come upon thee, and the power of the *Highest* shall overshadow thee; therefore, that holy thing that shall be born of thee, shall be called the *Son of God*." It was made manifest, likewise, by the evidence of the senses, when, at the baptism of our Lord in the River Jordan, the Holy Spirit descended like a dove, and a voice from heaven, the voice of the Father, was heard—"This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Again, it is clearly contained in the salutation which the Apostles use in their Epistles—"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." Such expressions as these are most decided allusions to the Trinity.

But without *producing* all the texts, which have been repeatedly, and, indeed, unanswerably, alleged in support of the doctrine in question, they are, it may in general be remarked, so many and so express, that, did they contain any thing but a mystery, no possible dispute could arise about the sense and meaning of them. Most of them, indeed, are so clear (as, for instance, those which have just been produced), that they are only liable to wilful misinterpretation; and, therefore, though a superficial view of the doctrines of religion, which require an implicit faith, may dispose the *Infidel* to call in question the authority of religion itself; yet for men to dispute or doubt the doctrines of our religion, while they allow its authority, seems to be as whimsical an instance of folly, as human nature is capable of presenting.

I must not, however, omit to observe, that the Scriptures, which are so clear in the *Trinity of Persons*, are no less distinct as to the *Unity of the Godhead*. Hence we so often read of "*one Lord, one God*," and "*none other but He*," who is, therefore, called the "*only true God*." Although to the heathen, there "*are that are called gods many and lords many*," yet, to us Christians, "*there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by Him*." We are also baptized in the name of *three*; but we are taught nevertheless, and bound to profess, "*one Lord and one God, one Faith and one Baptism*." In all which, we are assured that there is no absurdity or inconsistency, since "*there be three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost*," and "*these three are one*." And what greater proof can be reasonably demanded of a doctrine so sublime, and so much above our comprehension, than that *three* persons should be mentioned in Scripture, the only source of supernatural knowledge, in terms proper to God alone; that they should be described as *one God*; and that each should have perfections attributed to him, which are peculiar to God alone?

The truth is, that it is the mysterious nature of this doctrine, which alone has given rise to objections against it. It is utterly impossible for human reason to unravel and explain it; and, therefore, the unbeliever presumptuously dares to question its credibility. This is evidently owing to an erroneous idea of the proper subjects of rational inquiry, and to the jealousy with which *reason* regards her supposed privileges. Human reason is, doubtless, a test of truth, as far as her capacity, which is evidently limited, extends; and never is

she more honourably employed, than in candidly investigating the evidences of religion. But there is, indisputably, a certain point, at which reason stops, whatever be the nature of her inquiries. Not only in religious, but in natural truths, the powers of the understanding are circumscribed, but the necessity of belief is infinite. The nature of the eye, the process of vegetation, and the animating power of human life, are subjects which defy the curiosity of man, and compel him to admit what he cannot comprehend. But it is not so with the Bible sceptic. He sees certain articles proposed to him as trials of his faith, which he instantly rejects as false, because they exceed his limited understanding. But reason has no right to dispute a fact, unless it is able to disprove it. A man would be looked upon as worse than mad, were he to deny the growth of a tree, because he cannot discern the vegetating powers which cause its growth. It does not follow, that because a doctrine *surpasses* the reach of human reason, that it necessarily *contradicts* human reason. On the contrary, every individual doctrine of the Gospel, though totally undiscoverable by mortal wisdom, and inconceivable by mortal capacity, is perfectly consistent with reason, and beyond its power to dispute. Is there any thing unreasonable, for instance, in the doctrine of man's redemption, or can reason offer any thing to controvert its truth? The divinity and incarnation of our blessed Lord, and his atonement for the sins of man upon the cross, are doctrines which it would be presumptuous to endeavour to unfold; but is it not worse than impious to cavil at the method, which an all-merciful God employs in reconciling to himself his sinful and rebellious creatures? Surely it were better for man, who cannot comprehend the nature of the objects around him, to check his inquisitive researches into the hidden mysteries of God.

If however the doctrine of the Trinity is infinitely beyond the understanding, it is admirably adapted to the religious wants and necessities of man. The corruption of mankind, by which we are rendered incapable of paying that love and obedience which is confessedly due from a creature to his Creator, naturally calls for some satisfaction. This satisfaction is made by the death of Christ upon the Cross, and it seems almost impossible that any other should have been a sufficient sacrifice. It would clearly be preposterous for any one human being, to look up to another mere human being, who should by his own merits have acquired such influence with the supreme Creator as to atone for his fellow creature's transgressions. But the harmony between the doctrine of Redemption and the divinity of Christ, the second person in the Trinity, at once removes every difficulty. The part also which the Holy Ghost bears in the Trinity is excellently calculated to assist the spiritual infirmities of man. There are certain conditions to be performed by every member of the Christian covenant, which by his unassisted and frail nature he is utterly incapable of performing. But the sincere believer is enabled to overcome all the difficulties of his Christian warfare, by the secret, but effectual, co-operation of the Holy Spirit.

Having now set before you the truth, the reasonableness, and the blessings of the Scripture doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, I shall

conclude by drawing a few practical inferences from what has been said.

Every person, when admitted into the congregation of Christ's flock by baptism, is received in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The belief in this doctrine therefore is fundamentally essential to the very profession of Christianity; and every person, who is a sincere disciple of Jesus Christ, will therefore be steadfast in the faith whereby he was made a member of his Church. He will be most anxious to avoid those errors and heresies which of all others strike the deepest at the very root of our religion, by denying the truth of its most distinguishing doctrine, the holy Trinity. It is this article of belief which so clearly separates and exalts the Christian above the followers of every other creed; for though there are several sects who disbelieve the Trinity of persons, there are very few who deny the existence of a God. But the mere belief of a doctrine, the assent of the understanding only, is but a secondary part of our Christian calling. The sincerity of our faith must be manifested by the purity of our actions. As we excel others in the truth of our profession, we must excel them also in the holiness of our lives and conversations. We must show ourselves to be Christians indeed, by believing the assertions, trusting on the promises, fearing the threatenings, and obeying the precepts of Christ our Master; that even infidels and heretics "may see our good works," and be led thereby "to glorify our Father which is in heaven." We should endeavour to outstrip all others, in our piety towards God, in love to our neighbours, charity to the poor, unity amongst ourselves, and justice to all mankind. This indeed would be a clear demonstration that our faith is the best, inasmuch as our lives are the holiest. And be assured, that if we believe what Christ has taught us, and do what he has commanded us, we shall also obtain what he has promised, and enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, in the presence of that mysterious and holy Being, in whose name we were baptized; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost for evermore.

But let us examine more closely the momentous truths, in which as Christians we have been instructed; all that was taught, promised, and effected, by a divine, incarnate, crucified, and exalted Saviour. We have not only been baptized into the name of Christ, but we have been begotten again by him to a lively hope,—we have been taught the articles of our faith, the commands of our Master, the vows which are upon us, and the obligations which accompany all that a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health. We have, most of us, by our own mouths, ratified the promises and vows which were made in our behalf. We have received those holy mysteries, in the participation of which we are "fed with the spiritual food of the precious body and blood of Jesus Christ." We have thus become "very members incorporate of the mystical body of the Son of God:" we thus "show forth the Lord's death till his coming again;" professing that we are "heirs through hope of his everlasting kingdom," and praying unto our God to "grant that by the merits and death of his Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all his whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all the

other benefits of his passion." We have been instructed in all these great and consolatory truths, and we have professed to believe them. If we have herein "witnessed a good confession," we may entertain a good hope of this salvation through the promised mercy of a gracious God.

"So we preach, and so ye have believed;" or else, "he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God: but he that believeth on him is not condemned." It will little avail you to receive the best instructions, and in your judgment to be convinced of the certainty of them, unless with the heart ye "believe unto righteousness, make confession with the mouth unto salvation, and adorn the doctrine of God your Saviour in all things." "Wherefore give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things,—if ye add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity: if these things be in you, and abound, they shall make you, that ye be neither barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ; and so ye shall never fall, but an entrance be administered to you abundantly into his everlasting kingdom." And soon will he accomplish that prayer, which we offer when we assemble round the opened grave, soon will he "accomplish the number of his elect, and hasten his kingdom." Soon will the time of his second coming be fulfilled. Soon will each of us be consigned to the tomb, where we must await the summons of that day. "The kingdom of God," with which our final redemption shall draw nigh, "is near at hand. Repent ye, therefore, and believe the Gospel."

T.

MISCELLANEOUS.

AN EXACT ACCOUNT of the whole PROCEEDINGS against the Right Rev. Father in God, HENRY, LORD BISHOP OF LONDON, before the LORD CHANCELLOR, and the other Ecclesiastical Commissioners. London, 1688.

THE KING'S ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSION.

JAMES the Second, by the grace of God, King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c. to the Most Reverend Father in God, our right trusty and right well-beloved cancellor, William, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and Metropolitan. And to our right trusty and right well-beloved councillor George Lord Jefferyes, Lord Chancellor of England. And to our right trusty, and right well-beloved cousin and cancellor, Lawrence, Earl of Rochester, Lord High Treasurer of England. And to our right trusty and right well-beloved cousin and cancellor, Robert Earl of Sunderland, President of our Council, and our principal Secretary of State. And to the Right Reverend Father in God, our right trusty and well-beloved cancellor, Nathanael Lord Bishop of Duresme.

And to the Right Reverend Father in God, our right trusty and well-beloved Thomas Lord Bishop of Rochester. And to our right trusty and well-beloved councillor, Sir Edward Herbert, Knight, Lord Chief Justice of the Pleas, before us to be holden, assigned, greeting. We for divers good weighty and necessary causes and considerations, us hereunto especially moving, of our meer motion and certain knowledge, by force and virtue of our supream authority and prerogative royal, do assign, name, and authorize by these our letters patent, under the great seal of England, you the said Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Chancellor of England, Lord High Treasurer of England, Lord President of our Council, Lord Bishop of Duresme, Lord Bishop of Rochester, and our Chief Justice aforesaid, or any three or more of you, whereof you the said Lord Chancellor to be one, from time to time, and at all times during our pleasure, to exercise, use, occupy and execute under us all manner of jurisdictions, privileges, and pre-eminencies in any wise touching or concerning any spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdictions, within this our realm of England, and dominion of Wales, and to visit, reform, redress, order, correct, and amend all such abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities whatsoever, which by the spiritual or ecclesiastical laws of this our realm can or may lawfully be reformed, redressed, corrected, restrained, or amended, to the pleasure of Almighty God, and increase of virtue, and the conservation of the peace and unity of this realm. And we do hereby give and grant unto you, or any three or more of you, as is aforesaid, whereof you the said Lord Chancellor to be one, thus by us named, assigned, authorised and appointed, by force of our supream authority and prerogative royal, full power and authority, from time to time, and at all times during our pleasure, under us to exercise, use and execute all the premises, according to the tenor and effect of these our letters-patents, any matter or cause to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding. And we do by these presents give full power and authority unto you, or any three or more of you, as is aforesaid, whereof you the said Lord Chancellor to be one, by all lawful ways or means from time to time hereafter during our pleasure, to enquire of all offences, contempts, transgressions, and misdemeanours done and committed, and hereafter done and to be committed, contrary to the ecclesiastical laws of this our realm, in any county, city, borough, or other place or places exempt or not exempted, within this our realm of England, and dominion of Wales; and of all and every offender or offenders therein, and them, and every of them, to order, correct, reform, and punish, by censure of the Church. And also we do give and grant full power and authority unto you, or any three or more of you, as is aforesaid, whereof you the said Lord Chancellor to be one, in like manner as is aforesaid, from time to time, and at all times during our pleasure, to enquire of, search out, and call before you all and every ecclesiastical person or persons, of what degree or dignity soever, as shall offend in any of the particulars before mentioned, and them and every of them to correct, and punish for such their misbehaviours and misdemeanours, by suspending or depriving them from all promotions ecclesiastical, and from all functions in the church, and to inflict such other punishments or censures upon them,

according to the ecclesiastical laws of this realm. And further we do give full power and authority unto you, or any three or more of you, as is aforesaid, whereof you the said Lord Chancellour to be one, by virtue hereof, and in like manner and form as is aforesaid, to enquire, hear, determine, and punish all incest, adulteries, fornications, outrages, misbehaviours, and disorders in marriage, and all other grievances, great crimes or offences which are punishable, or re-formable by the ecclesiastical laws of this our realm, committed or done, or hereafter to be committed or done, in any place exempt or not exempt, within this our realm, according to the tenor of the ecclesiastical laws in that behalf: granting you, or any three or more of you as is aforesaid, whereof you the said Lord Chancellour to be one, full power and authority to order and award such punishment to every such offender, by censures of the Church, or other lawful ways as is aforesaid; and further we do give full power and authority unto you, or any three or more of you, as is aforesaid, whereof you the said Lord Chancellour to be one, all and every offender and offenders in any of the premises, and also all such, as by you, or any three or more of you as is aforesaid, whereof you the said Lord Chancellour to be one, shall seem to be suspected persons in any of the premises, and them to examine, touching every or any of the premises which you shall object against them; and to proceed against them, and every of them, as the nature and quality of the offence, or suspicion in that behalf shall require. And also to call all such witnesses, or any other person or persons that can inform you concerning any of the premises, as you, or any three or more of you as is aforesaid, whereof you the said Lord Chancellour to be one, and them, and every of them, to examine upon their corporal oaths, for the better tryal and opening of the truth of the premises, or any part thereof. And if you, or any three or more of you, as is aforesaid, whereof you the said Lord Chancellour to be one, shall find any person or persons whatsoever obstinate or disobedient in their appearance before you, or any three or more of you as is aforesaid, whereof you the said Lord Chancellour to be one, at your calling and commandment, or else not in obeying, or in not accomplishing your orders, decrees, and commandments, or any thing touching the premises or any part thereof, or any other branch or clause contained in this commission, that then you, or any three or more of you, as is aforesaid, whereof you the said Lord Chancellour to be one, shall have full power and authority to punish the same person and persons so offending, by excommunication, suspension, deprivation, or other censures ecclesiastical; and when any person shall be convented or prosecuted before you as aforesaid, for any of the causes above expressed, at the instance and suit of any person prosecuting the offence in that behalf, that then you, or any three or more of you as is aforesaid, whereof you the said Lord Chancellour to be one, shall have full power and authority to award such costs and expenses of the suit, as well to and against the party, as shall prefer or prosecute the said offence, as to and against any party or parties that shall be convented according as their causes shall require, and to you in justice shall be thought reasonable. And further our will and pleasure is, that you assume our well-beloved

subject William Bridgman, Esq. one of the clerks of our council, or his sufficient deputy or deputies in that behalf to be your register, whom we do by these presents depute to that effect, for the registering of all your acts, decrees, and proceedings, by virtue of this our commission; and that in like manner, you, or any three or more of you, whereof you the said Lord Chancellour to be one, by your discretions shall appoint one or more messenger or messengers, or other officer or officers necessary and convenient to attend upon you for any service in this behalf. Our will and express commandment also is, that there shall be two paper books invented and made, the one to remain with the said register, or his sufficient deputy or deputies, the other with such person, and in such places as you the said commissioners, or any three or more whereof you the said Lord Chancellour to be one, shall in your discretions think most fit and meet; in both which books shall be fairly entered all the acts, decrees, and proceedings made or to be made, by virtue of this our commission. And whereas our Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and divers cathedral and collegiate churches, colledges, grammar schools, and other ecclesiastical incorporations, have been erected, founded, and endowed by several of our royal progenitors, kings and queens of this realm, and some others by their charity and bounty of some of their subjects, as well within our Universities as other parts and places, the ordinances, rules and statutes whereof are either imbesled, lost, corrupted, or altogether imperfect. We do therefore give full power and authority to you, or any five or more of you, of whom we will you the forenamed the Lord Chancellour always to be one, to cause and command in our name, all and singular the ordinances, rules, and statutes of our said universities, and all and every cathedral and collegiate churches, colledges, grammar schools, and other ecclesiastical incorporations, together with their several letters-patents, and other writings, touching or in any wise concerning their several erections and foundations, to be brought and exhibited before you, or any five or more of you, as is aforesaid, whereof you the said Lord Chancellour to be one; willing, commanding, and authorizing of you, or any five or more of you, as aforesaid, whereof you the said Lord Chancellour to be one, upon the exhibiting, and upon diligent and deliberate view, search, and examination of the said statutes, rules and ordinances, letters-patents and writings as is aforesaid, the same to correct, amend and alter; and also where no statutes are extant, in all or any of the aforesaid cases, to devise and set down such good orders and statutes as you, or any five or more of you, whereof you the said Lord Chancellour to be one, shall think meet and convenient, to be by us confirmed, ratified, allowed, and set forth, for the better order and rule of the said Universities, cathedral and collegiate churches, colledges, and grammar schools, erections, and foundations, and the possessions and revenues of the same, and as may best tend to the honour of Almighty God, increase the virtue, learning and unity in the said places, and the publick weal and tranquility of this our realm. Moreover, our will, pleasure, and commandment is, that you, our said commissioners, and every of you, shall diligently and faithfully execute this our commission, and every part and branch thereof, in manner and form aforesaid,

and according to the true meaning thereof, notwithstanding any appellation, provocation, privilege, or exemption in that behalf, to be had, made, pretended, or alledged by any person or persons resident or dwelling in any place or places exempt or not exempt, within this our realm; any law, statutes, proclamations, or grants, privileges, or ordinances, which be or may seem contrary to the premises notwithstanding. And for the better credit, and more manifest notice of your so doing, in the execution of this our commission, our pleasure and commandment is, that to your letters missive, processes, decrees, orders and judgments, for or by you, or any three or more of you, as is aforesaid, to be awarded, sent forth, had, made, decreed, given or pronounced, at such certain publick places as shall be appointed by you, or any three or more of you, as is aforesaid, for the due execution of this our commission, you, or some three or more of you as is aforesaid, whereof you the said Lord Chancellour to be one, shall cause to be put and fixed a seal, ingraven with a rose and crown, and the letter J. and figure 2 before, and the letter R. after the same, with a ring or circumference about the same seal, containing as followeth, *Sigillum Commissionariorum Regiæ Majestatis ad Causas Ecclesiasticas*. Finally, we will and command all and singular other our ministers and subjects in all and every place and places, exempt and not exempt, within our realm of England, and dominion of Wales, upon any knowledge or request from you, or any three or more of you as is aforesaid, to them, or any of them, given or made, to be aiding, helping and assisting unto you, and to your commandments, in and for the due executing your precepts, letters, and other processes, requisite in and for the due executing of this our commission, as they, and every of them tender our pleasure, and will answer the contrary at their utmost perils. In witness, &c.

THE KING'S LETTER,

Dated Monday, June the 14th, 1686, delivered at Fulham on Thursday, being the 17th of the same June in the afternoon, by Mr. Atterbury the Messenger.

JAMES R.

Right Reverend Father in God, we greet you well. Whereas we have been informed and are fully satisfied, that Dr. John Sharp, rector of the parish church of St. Giles in the Fields, in the county of Middlesex, and in your diocess, notwithstanding our late letter to the most Reverend Fathers in God the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and our directions concerning preachers, given at our court at Whitehall, the 15th of March, 1685, in the second year of our reign; yet he, the said Dr. John Sharp, in contempt of the same orders, hath in some of the sermons he hath since preached, presumed to make unbecoming reflections, and to utter such expressions as were not fit or proper for him; endeavouring thereby to beget in the minds of his hearers an evil opinion of us and our government, by insinuating fears and jealousies to dispose them to discontent, and to lead them into disobedience and rebellion. These are therefore to require and command you immediately upon receipt hereof, forthwith to suspend him from further preaching in any parish church or chappel in your diocess, until he has given us satisfaction, and our further pleasure be known

herein. And for so doing this shall be your warrant : and so we bid you heartily farewell. Given at our court at Windsor, the 14th day of June, 1686, in the second year of our reign.

By His Majesties command.

SUNDERLAND.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON'S ANSWER.

Sent by Dr. Sharp to the Earl of Sunderland, then at Hampton Court, upon Fryday June 18, who could have no answer.

To the Right Honourable, the Earl of Sunderland, Lord President, &c.

MY LORD,

I always have, and shall count it my duty to obey the King in whatever commands he lays upon me, that I can perform with a safe conscience : but in this, I humbly conceive, I am obliged to proceed according to law ; and therefore it is impossible for me to comply ; because though His Majesty commands me only to execute his pleasure, yet in the capacity I am, to do it, I must act as a judge ; and your Lordship knows no judge condemns any man before he has knowledge of the cause, and has cited the party. However, I sent to Mr. Dean, and acquainted him with His Majesties displeasure, whom I find so ready to give all reasonable satisfaction, that I have thought fit to make him the bearer of this answer, from him that will never be unfaithful to the king, nor otherwise than

My Lord, your Lordships most humble Servant,

H. LONDON.

On Sunday after Dr. Sharp carried a petition to Windsor, which was not admitted to be read. Which is as follows.

To the King's most excellent Majesty, the humble petition of John Sharp, Clerk,
Sheweth

That nothing is so afflictive to your petitioner as his unhappiness to have incurred your Majesties displeasure, which he is so sensible of, that ever since your Majesty was pleased to give notice of it, he hath forborne all public exercise of his function, and still continues so to do.

Your petitioner can with great sincerity affirm, that ever since he hath been a preacher, he hath faithfully endeavoured to do the best service he could in his place and station, as well to the late king, your royal brother, as your Majesty, both by preaching and otherwise.

And so far he hath always been from venting any thing in the pulpit tending to schism or faction, or any way to the disturbance of your Majesties government, that he hath upon all occasions in his sermons, to the utmost of his power, set himself against all sorts of doctrines and principles that look that way : and this he is so well assured of that he cannot but apprehend that his sermons have been very much misrepresented to your Majesty.

But if in any sermon of his, any words or expressions have unwarily slipped from him, that have been capable of such constructions, as to give your Majesty cause of offence, as he solemnly professes he had no ill intention in those words or expressions, so he is very sorry for them, and resolves for the future to be so careful in the discharge of his duty, that your Majesty shall have reason to believe him to be your most faithful subject.

And therefore he earnestly prayeth that your Majesty out of your royal grace and clemency, would be pleased to lay aside the displeasure you have conceived against your humble petitioner, and restore him to that favour which the rest of the clergy enjoy under your Majesties gracious government.

So shall your petitioner ever pray, &c.

[We shall proceed with the particulars of the Trial in our next Number.]

VISITING SOCIETY.

MR. EDITOR,—Among sundry advertisements in the fly leaves of the *Christian Observer*, I met with an account of a New Visiting Society, to be established in the neighbourhood of the metropolis. As I only took up the publication casually, I can only quote from memory: but I believe I shall not materially err, in stating that it is the object of this Society to communicate SPIRITUAL INSTRUCTION to the poor by means of LADIES: that the co-operation of the local Clergyman is to be first requested, but, if refused, the Society is to proceed as usual. "Can these things be?" Is there no protection for the rights of the Clergy and the interests of religion in the Canon or Common Law? He ill deserves the name of man who respects not the female sex; but those who truly entertain such respect, will grieve to behold so miserable a degradation of all that is amiable and engaging in that portion of the human species! A female spiritual quack! male ones are bad enough.

I am, Sir, yours, obediently,

QUEERENS.

RULES FOR TRAVELLERS.

IN a little devotional tract, "written in Latin, by the Right Hon. Sir Harbottle Grimston, Baronet, Master of the Rolls, Speaker of the first parliament under Charles II. in the 12th year of his reign," and subsequently translated by J. B. under the title of a "Christian New Year's Gift, or Exhortation to the Practice of Virtue, in 1677,"—the following letter to his son, "Concerning travelling," is introduced. It contains many valuable remarks, and will be read with much profit and interest. Bishop Burnet says of him, in his History of his own Times, (Vol. II. p. 68. 8vo.)—"He was a very pious and devout man, and spent every day at least an hour in the morning, and as much at night, in prayer and meditation: and even in winter, when he was obliged to be very early on the bench, he took care to rise so soon, that he had always the command of that time, which he gave to those exercises." X.

DEAR SON,—That you might at least have one good associate and faithful guide in your journey, I here give you a few precepts, concerning travelling, to be well observed in your egress, progress, and ingress, towards God, towards yourself, and towards others.

First of all, you must seriously propose to your thoughts the end,

advantage, and ultimate design of travelling; and for your better information herein, be sure to consult with, and to take the advice of your wisest friends.

Use all diligence to inform your understanding, and to get a critical and true notion of things; that so you may rightly distinguish between good and evil: but be modest in your consultation with others, and be not ashamed to be taught by any.

Speak but sparingly of yourself and yours; and that but amongst some few particular persons.

Avoid all kind of rash and over-prying curiosity, lest the consequence of it prove dangerous.

Remember, that to be seemingly mute and deaf, are no imperfections in a strange country: yet carry yourself friendly and civilly, with a courteous affability to strangers, and all persons, that you meet with; and, casting aside the morose kind of rustick bashfulness, accustom yourself to a free modesty in all your behaviour.

Be not too lavish in laughing at others, or making them the object of your derision.

Present your commendations often, and pay your duty frequently to your friends either by letters or messengers.

Endeavour, that whatever abridgment you have of outward conveniences in the sincere worship of God, such a proportionable addition be made to your inward devotion without any kind of hypocrisy.

Pass away the tediousness of travelling with the harmless mirth of pleasant stories and innocent discourses, without any sort of scurrility either in words or deeds: and intersperse and season your journey with holy meditation, religious talk, and pious hymns.

As for your abode in any place, be sure to make a diligent and cautious inquiry into the ecclesiastical rites and ceremonies, into the political government, and into the usual manners, and civil customs of the same.

Entertain not that vanity of priding yourself with the show of much money or jewels, for that will be a means only to invite thieves, and prove a snare to your own safety.

Do not gaze at or admire any thing with astonishment; for that will redound to the discredit of your country, and be an argument that you never saw the like at home; and on the other side, do not decry or fastidiously detract from any thing that is truly worthy of admiration; lest thereby you betray yourself to infamy, and seem both injurious and indiscreet.

If you have obtained a familiarity and promptness in the Latin tongue, then into what strange parts soever you go, you will not be a stranger.

The wisdom and ingenuity of most nations lie couched under their proverbs: therefore it behoves you to acquire the knowledge of their language.

Do not shun the society of your own countrymen, lest you should seem to slight and despise them; and yet be not over-greedily ambitious of their company, for 'tis altogether unprofitable, and beside your present purpose.

Every nation is famous for some things, and infamous for others ; so that it has both a badge of honour, and a mark of disgrace.

Whatever you meet with, that deserves to be remembered, commit it to writing, for it may be afterwards both advantageous and delightful.

Be always mindful, that you never do, nor suffer any thing unworthy of your country. Abstain from that which you cannot endure ; yet do not disgracefully decline dangers, nor rashly invite them. But behave yourself so in all things, that you may give a good account both to God and your friends.

As for your return, when you come back into your native country, do not indulge yourself in telling strange stories, and prattling beyond belief, lest you become famous only for lying.

And do not now despise your own possessions and domestic concerns, though you have seen many greater, nobler, and more pleasant elsewhere. But you ought to consider rather, *who* you return, than from *whence* ; and endeavour to return better and wiser ; and not seem so much to have changed the heavens as your intellects, (*cœlum non animum*) for he returns in the greatest poverty imaginable, that has lost himself abroad.

Be willing to inform the ignorant in those things which they ask ; and though their questions may perhaps be somewhat ridiculous or erroneous, yet expose them not, but modestly correct their errors.

And when you have performed your duty to God and your friends, be not a stranger now at home too ; but look over the face of things, and inquire whether your country (in your absence) hath added, altered, or diminished any thing.

Lastly, at this and all other times, you owe many things to yourself, more to your friends, and all to God.

These things your most loving earthly father had to give you in his commands ; who does recommend you, both at home and abroad, to the protection and conduct of the Father of Lights, Lord of heaven and earth, who will fully illuminate and guide you in the ways of righteousness.

I am, &c.

SCHISM.

(Continued from p. 317.)

II. WE commence our second division of Mr. Towgood's objections, which come under the head MISTAKES.

Mr. Towgood is entirely mistaken in his statement respecting the Athanasian Creed, and the Burial Service : and, more especially, when he states that they are inconsistent with each other.

That Mr. Towgood should have been scandalized at the Athanasian Creed, is scarcely matter of surprise ; since it has been excepted to by stronger minds than his. And, certainly, objections to a *creed*, if rightly grounded, are a very sufficient justification of separate communion. But it will soon be manifested that Mr. T.'s arguments against this creed are founded in the very grossest misconception.

We do not here intend to discuss the propriety of the famous damnatory clauses. Such discussion would be irrelevant. We shall

state in few words the situation of the argument upon them, and then examine on what ground Mr. Towgood has approached them. In their favour, it is contended that our Lord has said expressly, "He that believeth not shall be damned:" and this manifestly must include the most important parts of Christian revelation. It is therefore stated to be a false and cruel liberality to disguise, and even not to proclaim what our Lord has so positively determined. On the other hand, it is affirmed that no such anathema is necessary, and, that it gives a needless offence. This is the state of the argument, which it is unnecessary further to pursue. Now let us see how Mr. Towgood regards it. He begins with a direct falsehood, which, however, we are very willing to cover with the gentler term of a *mistake*, although such a mistake is not very excusable in one who writes with Mr. Towgood's professions.

Methinks, Sir, it should a little check your triumph over us here, to remember, that some of the wisest and most illustrious members of your Church, both clergy and laity, account the use of this creed your great sin and reproach, and with Archbishop Tillotson, wish you were well rid of it.—P. 28.

We would gladly know who these "wise and illustrious" churchmen are. Undoubtedly many such—Bishop Tillotson among the number, and we will add, Bishop Tomline, *objected* to the damnable clauses; but if they had regarded these, and much more *the whole creed*, a "GREAT SIN," they would not have remained in a Church which publicly professed it. Could Mr. Towgood have produced the passages from the writings of these "wise and illustrious" men, where such a sentiment appeared? If he could, we will take leave to say they were neither wise nor illustrious, but fools and hypocrites of the very blackest dye: fools, for disclosing their iniquity; hypocrites, for subsisting on the doctrines they disclaimed.

Mr. Towgood then flourishes off in his very choicest style:

What! are you, Sir, amongst the weak and uncharitable minds who *damn to the pit of hell* those who cannot receive all the dark and mysterious points set forth in that creed? Do you in your conscience think that there is no salvation for those who do not faithfully believe the several articles it contains, and that whosoever doth not keep whole and undefiled the faith therein delivered, he shall without doubt perish everlastingly? What! the many great and worthy persons, bright ornaments of your own Church, (who, instead of *keeping it whole and undefiled*, have openly disavowed, preached, and wrote against it, dying in this unbelief,) have they *without peradventure everlastingly perished*? Alas! for the good Doctors Clarke, Whitby, Burnet, &c.—for the illustrious Sir Isaac Newton, &c. &c. Yea, alas! for the whole Greek Church, who, for having rejected that clause, both in the Athanasian and the Nicene Creed, commonly called *Filioque*, which asserts that the Holy Ghost is of the Father and the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding, are gone down, it seems, to the infernal pit; so that, notwithstanding their great knowledge and piety in this world, yet, for not believing the Athanasian Creed, they are sunk into everlasting darkness and damnation in the other! Do you wonder that Deism prevails if this be genuine Christianity?—P. 29.

Here is a mistake which every child in theology can correct; nay, which it only requires the perusal of the Creed to refute. If any unprejudiced person, on reading that creed, should incline to believe that the damnable clauses relate to Athanasius's exposition of the Trinity, not to the mere doctrine itself; against a mind so constituted

we draw not the weapons of logic. There are certain doctrines called *essential*, that is, *essential to salvation*; if Mr. Towgood thought the Trinity one of these, he would not have held the damnatory clauses *false*, as applied only to that doctrine, and not to a peculiar view of it; although he might have objected to them on different grounds. If Mr. Towgood did *not* think the Trinity in Unity an essential doctrine, it will exhaust his advocate's ingenuity to defend him from the accusation of Socinianism.*

We may further observe, that Mr. Towgood again blunders about the "bright ornaments of our Church," who "openly disavowed, preached, and wrote against the Athanasian Creed." How any man can be a "bright ornament" of a Church, who openly disavows, preaches, and writes against its doctrines, surpasses our humble comprehension. It is surprising that, since it costs so little to be a "bright ornament" of the Church, Mr. Towgood should have preferred to twinkle in an inferior sphere. However, without attempting the arduous task of harmonizing Mr. Towgood's principles, we may again remark, that in this passage Mr. Towgood has evidently confounded objections to the *use* of the damnatory clauses with objections to their *matter*, and, still further, with objections to THE MATTER OF THE WHOLE CREED. A MISTAKE truly extraordinary, did not what we have already seen prepare us to take the advice of the philosophical poet, "NIL ADMIRARI."

An objection of a very serious kind, but involving a most material MISTAKE, for which however Mr. Towgood is only answerable as foster-father and patron, is contained in a note (p. 205,) to the following effect:

It is something (more than) odd, a learned Bishop of your own Church has lately observed, to have two creeds established in the same Church, in one of which those are declared accursed who deny the Son to be of the same hypostasis with the Father: and, in the other, it is declared they cannot be saved, but perish everlastingly, who do not assert that there is one hypostasis of the Father, and another of the Son.—*Essay on Spirit*, Sect. 146.—P. 205.

If the "Essay on Spirit" were written by a Bishop of the Established Church, he must have been one of Mr. Towgood's "wise and illustrious" "bright ornaments." But with him we have nothing to do. His inference is artful, but it is a MISTAKE nevertheless. "Hypostasis" means *substance*. Now, what contradiction is there in saying of two pieces of the same gold, that they are of the same *substance*, but that they are two *substances*? We do not put this forth as an illustration of the doctrine of the Trinity, which we must rather be content to believe than to illustrate; but we think it quite sufficiently vindicates the *language* of our creeds from the charge of inconsistency.

But what shall we say of such assertions as the following? What must have been the circumstances which led to a MISTAKE like this?

It is a fact, I PRESUME, indisputable, that a great part of the most learned and virtuous of your clergy are departed from the Athanasian doctrine!—P. 29.

"I presume!" this, alas, is not the only instance of Mr. Towgood's

* See Preface to Ninth Edition, p. 10.

presumption. But something more than presumption is called for, when a large body of Christians, men of honour by education, men of religion both by education and express profession, are to be charged with deliberate and wilful hypocrisy. As Bishop Watson addressed an equally rash and daring accuser, "PROOF, PROOF, Sir, is what we want;" prove what you say, indeed, if you can; but when hundreds of "learned and virtuous" characters are at stake, PRESUME NOTHING! To such an allegation it is, of course, unnecessary to reply. Presumption demands no refutation. But indeed the charge contains a much greater proportion of folly than of venom. "Learned" men in the Church may have occasionally become Socinians; but that "virtuous" men should, and remain in the Church, is a positive contradiction; unless Mr. Towgood's religious views can reconcile the most odious hypocrisy with the integrity of virtue.

Let us now consider the Burial Service, concerning which Mr. Towgood incurs so many mistakes that it is almost bewildering to disentangle them. And first of all, let us suppose the whole Burial Service to be the most objectionable thing imaginable. How could this form any part of a "FULL JUSTIFICATION" of dissent? It might indeed, as we have observed in another instance, have justly deterred Mr. Towgood from the ministerial office; but it could be no solid objection to lay communion. It is an office in which the objector could bear no part; and if he so desired, he might provide by will that his mortal remains might be equally unpolluted by it. Shall it be said, it were hard to deny a Christian leave to repose his bones in consecrated ground? Mr. Towgood scorns the very notion of such a consecration.* So that, indeed, if this ceremony were an obstacle to Church communion, it is one that might have been very easily removed.

But let the reader now prepare to profit by the *NIL ADMIRARI*! Mr. Towgood, with all his objections to the Burial Service, which are by no means moderate, has NO OBJECTION that THE REMAINS OF DISSENTERS SHOULD BE INTERRED WITH IT, AND THAT DISSENTERS SHOULD ATTEND IT! Yes, this same service, objectionable in itself, and objectionable inasmuch as it is ordained by an incompetent authority, this same Burial Service, marvelling reader, may nevertheless be conscientiously complied with! Well, indeed, may Mr. Towgood be dignified with the stately title of "unanswerable!" For he is the most unanswerable by others who best answers himself. We shall try to add something *responsive*, nevertheless.

But the reasoning by which this compliance is supported is at least as extraordinary as the concession itself. Our readers must not be deprived of so rich a curiosity.

Is the burial of the dead, Sir, a Christian institution? any part of the religion or worship of Christ? Is it not purely a political or civil thing? Yes: and as such only we view it; and consider the person who officiates as one appointed to this office, directed, instructed, and maintained by the State.—P. 57.

How very complacent! It is seldom that Mr. Towgood manifests so much respect for the State. We can understand the compliance of

* His MISTAKE on this subject shall not be unattended to.

a Dissenter with our marriage ceremony, because, except in some very few cases, only the Church form constitutes a legal marriage. But what compulsion is there on the part of the State to bury according to the rites of the Church? And what a MISTAKE is it to say that the Burial Service is "purely a political or civil thing," when, if ever there was an office wholly unconnected with the affairs of this world, it is that sublime and spiritual ritual! Of what consequence can it be to the State, how the dead are interred, so that decency and health are not offended? What an absurdity, too, a *legal burial*! What is this great advantage, of being *buried according to law*, which should induce a Christian solemnly before God to take part in prayers which he holds inconsistent, or impious, and that too in mockery of the dear remains of a departed friend, and in their very presence? Mr. Towgood, as we have seen, considered all our observances alike "political or civil things." In those things, then, at least where there is no express Scriptural command, he was bound, by his own showing, out of respect to the State, how much soever he might object to the practices themselves, to communicate with the Church.

The substance of all Mr. Towgood's objections to the Burial Service amounts to this: that the Church, in several expressions, speaks with absolute confidence of the salvation of the deceased, when it may happen that the individual was notoriously guilty of some great crime, or died impenitent by the hand of the executioner. One point we may notice, by the way, not as impairing Mr. Towgood's argument, such as it is, but as showing the carelessness with which the book is written. Mr. Towgood particularly instances the case of an impenitent *murderer*; now it is at first sight obvious, that no murderer, penitent or impenitent, can be an instance in point, inasmuch as, by the law, the bodies of all such are disposed of by *dissection*.

But Mr. Towgood has, in reality, MISTAKEN the purport of the expressions which he condemns. We will view them in order.

It is said indeed in the Burial Service, that "it hath pleased Almighty God, of his great mercy, to take unto himself the soul of our dear brother." This is little more than what Solomon himself says of all men indifferently at their death: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."* The souls of all return to God, and he deals with them according to his wisdom. It is this dispensation generally, and not any supposed especial mercy to the deceased which is alluded to in the expression, "His great mercy." It is a great mercy that God should have this care of human souls; and although a soul may have, by wilful disobedience, fitted itself for destruction, that soul perishes not through any defect of divine mercy. It has been well observed that *civil* liberty may be enjoyed in a prison; that is, a man may be a prisoner, for reasons which impeach not, but rather confirm the free character of the institutions under which he is incarcerated. In a similar sense we may say a soul may be an object of the divine mercy in hell; inasmuch as the causes of condemnation may be such as rather establish than impugn the doctrine of the inexhaustible mercies of God.

* Eccl. xii. 7.

There is no impropriety, therefore, in saying concerning any person, of whatever character, that when God takes him to himself (as Scripture says he does all men) he takes him in mercy, though the justice of his government afterwards exacts condemnation.

Mr. Towgood thinks that there is a manifest inconsistency in thanking God that "it hath pleased him to deliver our brother out of the miseries of this sinful world," "though we have the strongest reason to believe that he is gone down to realms of greater misery below."* But where is the inconsistency? "The strongest reason" does not amount to absolute proof: and if it did, his eternal misery would have been his own seeking, while his deliverance from worldly calamities would still be the mercy of God. His present state we cannot see; his former miseries we could; that he is delivered from these we know, and for that deliverance it is our duty to be thankful. All misery beyond is the effect, not of God's severity, but of the sinner's impenitence.

As to those passages which simply express a *hope* of the deceased person's salvation, we cannot discover what any Christian can object to them, which will not equally apply to the Scriptures themselves. Mr. Towgood has stated correctly the tenor of the lxviiith canon, that the only cases in which the Church denies the right of Christian burial are those of unbaptized persons, self-murderers, and persons under penalty of the greater excommunication. But the rubrick, a later, and more cogent authority, extends the prohibition to ALL excommunicate persons. The first of these excluded classes are no Christians; the last are no Churchmen; neither of these two classes therefore have any interest in the forms of the Church. Concerning the 2d (always supposing the act committed in sane mind) we doubt whether we may dare to hope; because our Lord has said, "Except ye repent, ye shall all perish:"† and we know that the self-murderer must necessarily die impenitent. But with regard to any others, with regard to all where there is no express prohibition in Scripture, "Charity hopeth all things:" and indeed this is the purport of the Apostle's solemn exhortation: "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others, WHICH HAVE NO HOPE."‡ Do we injure the memory of Mr. Towgood's Christian virtues, when we suppose that, had he been asked, even concerning an *apparently* impenitent MURDERER, do you hope this man's salvation or otherwise?—he would certainly have replied: "I do hope it, undoubtedly?" And what more than this does the Church express in the "hopes" of her Burial Service? What more has she done than what St. Paul COMMANDED the Thessalonians to do?

But there is one passage on this subject which we must not call a mistake; because Mr. Towgood must have been aware of his important falsification of the sense of the Church, having just before (p. 58) given the words correctly. He states:

"You are to profess, before God, *that you hope the man rests in Christ*, and pray that you yourselves may rest in Christ in the same manner as this your

* P. 59.

† Luke xiii. 3—5.

‡ 1 Thess. iv. 13.

brother doth, even though you have every reason to think that he *died in his sins*, and is therefore not gone to be with Christ, where nothing that is defiled can ever be admitted. Strange! and extremely shocking!—P. 59.

That there is no objection to *hope* the salvation of those, concerning whom there is every reason to *think* they died in their sins, is evident; nothing less than *absolute proof* being sufficient to justify abandonment of hope; and absolute proof can never be had in cases which apply to the present subject. But Mr. Towgood states that we pray that we may rest in Christ, "*in the same manner as this our brother doth!*" Were this true, it would indeed be "strange and extremely shocking," even in the case of such as might be, apparently, the most pious; for though it would be more charitable, it would not be less presumptuous, to speak positively of a man's salvation, than of his condemnation. But when we come to examine the expression in the actual service, we find that we only pray that we may rest in Christ, "*AS OUR HOPE IS THIS OUR BROTHER DOETH.*" Surely there is no harm in praying that we may be saved! Surely it is not so very unchristian to hope that our brother may have been saved likewise!

Let the candid and Christian reader take his own estimate of a cause which can require to be supported by these wilful and palpable misrepresentations; and of the character of an advocate who could condescend to them. Our readers have seen Mr. Towgood's shallowness, remissness, and inconsistency; they now see what they have to expect from his good faith.

We shall not weary the patience of our readers by retailing the miserable balderdash wherein Mr. Towgood endeavours to set the Burial Service against the Athanasian Creed, and to show that we hope for the salvation of Arians and Socinians who stand previously doomed by us to perish everlastingly. The supposition is full of mistakes; but one only is worthy notice. *ARIANS AND SOCINIANS ARE IPSO FACTO EXCOMMUNICATE!** they never, therefore, were contemplated by the Burial Service. If it be said it is not the *practice* of the Church to refuse them burial, that is nothing to the purpose. The decay of discipline in our Church is a deplorable fact, and one to which we shall recur under our third head; but it is rather the Church's misfortune than her fault, betrayed as she is above every established Church in Christendom; and it is certainly no justification of dissent, though it is a powerful argument for restoring the just and constitutional powers of THE CONVOCATION.

KING EDWARD'S PRIMER.

MR. EDITOR,—In your Number for February, you did me the honour of noticing my reprint of King Edward's Primer, and of certain prayers for private use, formerly inserted in the Book of Common Prayer. Of the latter, you say, "We have now before us a black-letter copy of the Common Prayer, printed in 1615, which contains these prayers. They are arranged in a different order from that which Mr. W. has adopted: and for what reason he has made this

* Canons iii, iv, v, vi, ix, x, xi, &c. &c.

change, and altered several forms of expression in the prayers themselves, we are at a loss to conceive."

Now, Sir, as I should be sorry to take needless liberties with our old divines, I hope you will permit me to observe upon this, that I made no change in the order of these prayers. They are arranged in the same manner in my Appendix as in the Common Prayer, printed with the first 4to edition of our authorized version of the Bible. The variation of arrangement, which caught your eye, must have originated with some of the publishers of the seventeenth century.

It is probable that the difference between the editions we have happened to consult, will equally account for some of the *altered forms of expression* which attracted your notice; but for how many I could not say without collating both; since there were a few uncouth expressions, which, as mentioned in my preface, I did think it better to change or omit.

I am, Sir, with sincere respect,
Your obedient Servant, HENRY WALTER.

[In the edition which we employed, and in a later one printed by Edward Barker in 1638, the following is the order of the prayers in question.

The figures in brackets denote Mr. W.'s arrangement.

1. A prayer necessary for all persons (9).
2. A prayer necessary to be said at all times, (not included in Mr. W.'s collection, but inserted at p. 83 of the Primer).
3. A general confession of sins, to be said every morning (4).
4. A prayer, to be said in the morning (5).
5. A prayer, to be said at night going to bed (11).
6. A prayer containing the duty of every Christian (1).
7. Certaine godly prayers for sundry dayes (2).
8. A prayer for trust in God (3).
9. A prayer against worldly carefulness (8).
10. A prayer against temptation (6).
11. A prayer for the obtaining of wisdom. Wisd. ix. (7).
12. A prayer for patience in trouble (10).
13. A prayer, to be said at the houre of death (12).

With respect to *uncouth* expressions, we confess that we are unable to discover any throughout the collection. There are quaintnesses and peculiarities of diction in abundance; but these form a beautiful feature in the prayers, and their removal destroys the character of the language of the time.]

SUNDAYS AND HOLYDAYS.

MR. EDITOR,—As I certainly would much rather find myself in agreement, than at variance with Clericus Urbanus, I am glad to discover that we are on one point in the same opinion; namely, that the question can only be truly settled by the Ordinary. But as to the mode of settlement, I confess, I am unconvinced by his reasonings.

I will concede the service for the 30th of January, not that I am absolutely convinced on the subject, but there is so valid a reason for the postponement of that service, that it cannot at all affect the general principle. It is one of those exceptions which most distinctly prove the rule. If Sunday must NEVER be a fast, there is nothing

surprising that this service should be appointed for the Monday; and the very appointment proves that, but for this reason, the extraordinary service would have taken precedence. Besides, enough is proved by the rubrics for the other national services; the gradations in which appear to me to be perfectly conclusive.

I will explain what I mean when I affirm that the service for the holyday is considered by our Church of greater importance than that for the Sunday. Unquestionably, the observance of a Sunday is of more importance than that of a saint's day, or even one of our Lord's festivals; the sabbath being directly of divine institution; the other, merely of human appointment. This I certainly admit, and this is all that the rubrick intends, when it places Sundays before other holidays. Of course, I could never mean to say, that if the choice lay between neglecting a Sunday and neglecting a festival of human appointment, the former alternative should be taken. But the truth is, we are in no such dilemma. What is our duty with respect to the Sabbath? We are to keep it holy. Well; and this we may do, and celebrate another festival at the same time. The collect for St. John Baptist's day is as devotional as that for "the First Sunday after Trinity." So that, on my view of the question, the Sunday and the holyday are in truth both observed; but on that of Clericus Urbanus, the latter is entirely sacrificed.

Besides, my opponent admitted that this change is "necessarily required when Christmas-day falls on a Sunday." This appears to me to be a concession of my principle; for Sunday is as *truly*, though not as *eminently*, superior to Christmas-day, as it is to any other festival of human appointment. If the service for Christmas-day ought, as I think all will allow, to take precedence of that for the Sunday, I know but one principle on which this preference can be made; and that principle is mine.

The argument drawn from the appointment of a first lesson for the Sunday is, I am satisfied, of no force whatever. There is no second lesson appointed for Sundays in general; so that here we are obliged to have recourse to the day of the calendar or the Saint's day. And though Clericus Urbanus may consider the service for the Saint's day inferior to that for the Sunday, he cannot consider it inferior to that for an ordinary day.

Like my courteous antagonist, I hope I am open to conviction; but, I regret to say, his arguments have not produced it.

I am, Mr. Editor, yours, very truly.

RUSTICUS.

GENESIS IV. 1.

MR. EDITOR,—I beg to offer a few observations on the translation of this passage, advocated by G. H. in your Numbers for June, July, and September last.

The proposed rendering requires for its support a revelation to be supposed which is not recorded. Now this in itself is a strong objection against it, unless it can be shown that no other rendering can be

sustained. This point G. H. has attempted to establish, but I do not think he has done it satisfactorily.

In the first place, great authorities are against it. G. H. admits that, with the exception of the Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel, all the ancient translators construe *eth* in this passage as a preposition. It is difficult to persuade oneself that Onkelos, and the Septuagint translators, did not understand sufficient of the idiom of the Hebrew language, to know whether or not it admitted of *eth* being, as it stands here, taken as a preposition. And if it be allowed that they knew so much of their own language, we have, in their translations, decisive evidence that it will admit of *eth* being rendered as a preposition in the present case, they having themselves so rendered it. Again, the translators of our received version were no mean Hebraists, and the same may be said of others of the older translators; they may, therefore, be believed capable of judging whether the Hebrew idiom would admit of *eth*, standing as it does here, being rendered as a preposition. I confess the more modern names who have rendered it as proposed, and who may have thought it against the idiom of the Hebrew language to render it otherwise, does not weigh with me so much as to satisfy me that the more ancient translators were ignorant on this point, and have rendered it in a manner the language will not bear.

That these more ancient translators have rendered *eth* as a preposition, is, to me, an authority that the language will bear that rendering. I argue for no more on their authority; because, if the language will bear both renderings, there is no reason to fetter our judgment by theirs in the choice we may adopt. At the same time, it is my decided opinion, that if *eth* may be rendered as a preposition, it ought to be so rendered, in preference to the proposed rendering, which requires a revelation to be supposed in order to support it; because I think it a point not to be disputed, that we ought never to resort to the supposition, I was about to say the fabrication, of a revelation from God, *without necessity*.

But, secondly, the passages quoted in support of the proposed rendering are not, as it appears to me, in point. In none of them could *eth*, with any sense, be rendered as a preposition; the construction of the sentences evidently require it to be rendered as *videlicet*. It is different in the case before us; the sense is perfect of itself, with *eth* rendered as a preposition. To render it otherwise, we must help it out, with supposing what we have no authority to suppose, beyond the necessity resulting from that mode of rendering.

Thirdly, it is allowed that *eth*, before Jehovah, is oftentimes rendered "from;" and it is not shown that those cases are different from the present in construction. Perhaps nothing could be argued from them either way; but it is a pity that the places were not quoted, or referred to, by G. H. that his readers might judge for themselves how far they did, or did not, favour either interpretation.

Fourthly, in respect of Gen. xlii. 4, "But Benjamin, Joseph's brother, Jacob sent not with his brethren," it is said, rightly enough, that the Hebrew word after *eth* cannot be rendered in apposition, as both nouns, except one is a noun of multitude, must be of the same

number, for that purpose. But supposing the Hebrew word had been in the singular number, it could not then have been rendered in apposition; the sense of the passage would prevent it. Now I wish to know whether the Hebrew idiom would have prevented *eth* being here used as a preposition, if the Hebrew word had been in the singular number instead of the plural (brother instead of brethren.) If the author might still have used *eth* in that case, and not have been obliged to substitute some other word or letter for a preposition, this appears to me an authority in support of rendering *eth* as a preposition in the case in question. If it be not considered so, I should like to know why not.

Is there any passage, independent of that in question, where a person is said to have gotten or received or obtained any thing from another, where *eth* is used as a preposition before the person from whom the thing is obtained? This seems important to be ascertained for the supporters of either rendering. If there be any such passage, it will be an authority in favour of the received rendering of the passage in question.

As to *Ish* never being used for a male child, it does not appear to me to be important whether it be so used or not in other places. It is admitted, by the reference to Gen. vii. 2, that it is used simply to designate the sex; why might not Eve have used it in this sense? It is not important to render it as signifying an adult, in order to support the supposition, that Eve referred to the promised Seed, whether she thought that promised seed would be of a divine nature or otherwise. I have gotten a man (a man-child), the Jehovah, would be perfect sense.

Neither does the criticism on *kana* appear to me of much moment; for Eve is not understood by any, I believe, as saying, whether as thanksgiving or otherwise, I have brought forth a man from the Lord. She had brought forth a male child, and she says, I have gotten or obtained a man from the Lord, in conformity with the language of the 127th Psalm, "Lo, children and the fruit of the womb, are an heritage and gift that cometh of the Lord." I do not see that any thing hinges on this.

The main question is, whether *eth*, as it here stands, can be used as a preposition. Assuming, from the authorities before-mentioned, that it may be so construed, it is an objection against it being rendered otherwise, as I have already noticed, that it requires us to suppose a revelation from God which is not recorded. Here, however, I should notice that G. H. in his concluding observations, seems to regard the record of this saying of Eve's as a record of a revelation having been made to her, that the promised Seed should be Jehovah. If the passage could not possibly be rendered otherwise than as G. H. advocates, perhaps it might be so regarded; but if it may, if the language will bear, that it be rendered otherwise, it cannot be so argued. And I would observe, that, at all events, this mode of recording a revelation of so much importance is without a parallel. We are in other cases expressly informed that the revelation is from God; in the present case, the revelation is, on the proposed rendering, nothing more than the record of an expression of Eve's, in which, at least in

one part, she is allowed to be in error. It is said, that though she mistook, in applying the term Jehovah to her child, and in conceiving it to be the promised Seed, she might, nevertheless, have had it revealed to her that the promised Seed, whenever born, would be Jehovah. This is certainly possible. But if we are to suppose revelations, may we not, on as good authority, suppose that sufficient would be revealed to her, at the same time, regarding the Jehovah, as to prevent her falling into such a mistake as to conceive a child born in the ordinary course of nature was he? If Moses recorded this expression of Eve's as a record of a revelation from God, it must be supposed it was recorded to guide the faith of his people and of posterity. But in what instance has it done so? If such a revelation as is supposed was made, and this is the record of it, how is it that neither Moses himself, when speaking of the prophet who should rise after him, nor on any other occasion, should refer to it; that it should not be noticed any where by any person in the Old or New Testament? Neither our Lord, nor his apostles, nor the prophets, have appealed to it, though express and clear as to the point of our Lord's divinity. That they have not noticed it, appears to me an argument against any such revelation having been made; at least, against this expression of Eve's being considered as a record of it.

It appears to me to be a further objection to the proposed rendering, that Eve is made to suppose her child to be the promised Seed, whilst she is supposed to be aware that the promised Seed was to be of another nature—was to be Jehovah. She may be well supposed, perhaps, to have imagined her child the promised Seed, if no more were revealed to her than is recorded; but how she could suppose it, when she knew the promised Seed should be Jehovah, I am at a loss to conceive. She could hardly have supposed that a child born of herself and Adam was of a nature differing from their own, and superior to it, without an additional revelation assuring her of the fact; and that, it is allowed, she had not.

Then, as to the confirmation of the doctrine of our Lord's divinity, afforded by the passage rendered as proposed; it does not appear to me to be such, unless it be established, that it is impossible to render the passage otherwise than as G. H. advocates; but many, of good authority, have rendered it otherwise. With such a difference of opinion, the proposed reading, and confirmation of our Lord's divinity contained in it, can only be considered as resting on conjecture; and it is, in my mind, weakening, rather than strengthening our faith, to extend its foundation on such uncertain ground as that is. On whatever we build our faith, if part of the foundation be shaken, it renders necessarily our belief less fixed and certain, although, in point of fact, enough may remain to support it securely.

Enough is revealed to us, we may be sure, for all the ends required of us; enough, assuredly, I think, for the establishing of the doctrine which the proposed construction is urged as a support. Without resorting to the doubtful passage before us, we may find, in the prophecies of the Old Testament, Jehovah expressly applied to our Lord—the promised Seed. And in the New Testament, besides

other testimonies to his divinity, he is expressly affirmed to be God. With these evidences, we need not be careful respecting the fate of Eve's declaration.

I will mention, in conclusion, what has often struck me, and perhaps others, as the occasion of Moses recording this passage, according to the rendering of the received translation; namely, to account for the name given to her first-born, as he records other expressions for the like purpose, as in the cases of Seth and Noah. I think it probable there was no other object in it.

U. Y.

PRO-POPERY SOPHISTRY.

MR. EDITOR,—Before this letter can reach the public eye, the death warrant of the British Constitution will have been sealed; but even were it otherwise, I should hope to produce little influence by argument in quarters where alone argument could be beneficial. The reasons which, within the space of two months, have converted princes, prelates, nobles and senators, are evidently of a nature which comes not within bow-shot of logic. But there is still a great and powerful tribunal, even that of public opinion, before which crowns, coronets, and mitres must submit to be arraigned. Connected intimately as this question is with our Christianity and our Church, I shall not deem it necessary to apologize in again trespassing on your kindness, by offering some remarks on one of the wretched sophisms, by which this ruinous measure has been supported.

The argument is, "That the Church of England can never be endangered so long as it retains its present purity." We know, indeed, that as far as its individual members are concerned, all the powers of earth and hell can never touch their SALVATION, so long as they are true to their profession. But this is quite a different thing from the safety of the Church Establishment, or even the temporal immunity of its constituent members. Did the purity of Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, and thousands of others, preserve them from the utmost terrors of Popish barbarity, or protect their pure Church from the most savage persecution? Did even the cries of innocent infants preserve them from the flame and the steel? Did the purity of our Church afford her any safeguard against the usurpation of the detestable bigot, James? Did the pure and heroic resistance of the seven Bishops produce any relenting softness in the heart of that callous tyrant? But, attached as I am to my Church, and pure as I believe her to be, I cannot believe her purer than the primitive. And did the purity of that Church prevail against a Herod, a Nero, or a Diocletian? Still more, did the purity of Him, concerning whom it is written, that "every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself even as He is pure,"—did even HIS spotless purity protect him from the cowardly cruelty of a governor who suffered his fears to betray his conscience, and from the malice of a ferocious hierarchy, who thirsted for his sacred blood? What then has the purity of the Church to do with its temporal safety?

Having noticed this gross perversion of reasoning, which runs in the very teeth of history, human nature, experience and tendency, I will not

seek much further to occupy your valuable pages. Allow me, however, in a few words, to express,—not my surprise, for we are now abundantly taught the “*nil admirari*,” but—my *feelings* at seeing your contemporary, the *Christian Observer*, swept along the vortex of conversion; condescending to become the adulator of an apostate and traitorous faction, and this too, in the holy name of Christianity! publishing, and complacently commending a long letter of the Rev. Daniel Wilson, a letter which not a little detracts from his consistency, and from his former fame (whether well earned or not I will not say). Let me further intrude to notice an expression which appears in my last letter. I am there made to call Popery *Catholicism*. If such an expression could have escaped my pen, I most certainly and most decidedly retract it; and I cannot but regret, by the way, that your publication, whose manliness, uprightness, consistency, good sense, and sound Christianity, I admire and reverence in the very highest degree, should have sanctioned a loose and incorrect mode of speaking, which really confounds the most essential distinctions, and passes a condemnation on Protestantism. Let us leave such terms to the Daniel Wilsons, and Sidney Smiths.

A CATHOLIC OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

KING'S COLLEGE.

MR. EDITOR,—It gives me sincere pain, and I think a similar feeling must be excited in the breasts of many staunch and uncompromising Protestants, to observe the very ominous aspect of affairs with regard to King's College, London. There does not exist in the United Kingdom a person more entirely hostile than myself to the measures which have recently received the sanction of the Legislature. Yet I cannot think that the best way of counteracting the injurious effects of those measures will be to cripple a great institution, which, in its maturity, may perhaps become a signal bulwark of our tottering Church. There can be no doubt, that, as matters stand, the whole discipline of King's College may be administered by Papists; but it would be so easy to insert in the statutes appointing the Council, the words “being Protestants,” and the general feeling of the proprietors is so decidedly in favour of such an amendment, that subscribers ought certainly to wait till this is done, before they withdraw their names. The step once taken, the Institution may be ruined, and repentance arrive too late. Supposing such to be the event, what would be gained? The unholy coalition of Popery and Infidelity would establish itself impregnably, without a single opposing circumstance, in the Gower-street Institution. There must, even in the most unfavourable state of King's College, exist a tendency to check *united* hostility to religion, which cannot but prove salutary, and may be so in the very highest degree.

Excuse these hurried remarks; but the emergency of the occasion would not allow me entirely to keep silence on the subject, and I shall be happy to see it treated by those who are in every respect far better qualified for the purpose than myself.

I am, Sir, Your obedient Servant,

ECCLESIASTICUS.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF SCRIPTURAL FACTS AND CUSTOMS,

By analogous Reference to the Practice of other Nations.

DIVINATION.

It would far exceed our limits to enter fully upon so extensive a subject as that included under the term divination. Suffice it to say, that the Jews at all periods of their history resorted to every mode adopted by their idolatrous neighbours of penetrating into futurity. With respect to the first of these, alluded to in Genesis xliv. 5, we know that one of the most celebrated monarchs of the Persians, the great Giamschid, together with Alexander and others, referred to prophetic cups, and Pliny alludes to a similar practice in his time. That wands and staffs were used for similar purposes is also known to us, on the authority of Strabo, who speaks of the rods held by the Magi during their religious ceremonies.

Gen. xliv. 5.—“Is this the cup whereby he divineth?”

Ezek. xxi. 21.—“For the king of Babylon stood at the parting of the way, at the head of the two ways, to use divination: he made his arrows bright, he consulted with images, he looked in the liver.”

Hosea iv. 12.—“My people ask counsel at their stocks, their staff declareth unto them.”

Tacitus (*de Moribus Germanorum*, ch. x.) thus explains their mode of divination by twigs or wands: The branch of a forest tree is cut into small pieces, which being all distinctly marked, are thrown at random on a white garment. With fervent prayers the priest, raising his eyes to heaven three times, holds up each segment of the twig, and as the marks rise in succession, interprets the decrees of fate.

The method taken by the Noaaid or Lapland Priest to recover stolen goods is this. He comes into the tent where he has reason to suspect the thief is to be found, and pouring a quantity of brandy into a dish, which then reflects the features of any person looking into it, he makes a number of grimaces over it, and appears to consider it with very great attention. After some length of time employed in this way, he takes the suspected Laplander aside, charges him with the fact, declares that he saw his face plainly figured to him in the dish, and threatens to let loose a swarm of ganic flies upon him, who shall torment him until he makes restitution.—*Acerbi's Travels*, Vol. ii. p. 312.

The king, who was one of our company, this day, at dinner, I observed, took particular notice of the plates; this occasioned me to make him an offer of one, either of pewter or of earthenware. He chose the first, and then began to tell us the several uses to which he intended to apply it. Two of them were so extraordinary, that I cannot omit mentioning them. He said that whenever he should have occasion to visit any of the other islands, he would leave this plate behind him at Tongataboo, as a sort of representative in his absence, that the people might pay it the same obeisance they do to himself in person. He was asked what had been usually employed for this purpose, before he got this plate; and we had the satisfaction of learning from him that this singular honour had been hitherto conferred on a wooden bowl, in which he washed his hands. The other extraordinary use to which he meant to apply it in the room of his wooden bowl was to discover a thief; he said that when any thing was stolen and the thief could not be found out, the people were all assembled together before him, when he washed his hands in water in this vessel; after which it was cleaned, and then the whole multitude advanced, one after another, and touched it in the same manner as they touch his foot when they pay him

obedience. If the guilty person touched it he died immediately upon the spot, not by violence, but by the hand of Providence; and if any one refused to touch it, his refusal was a clear proof that he was the man.—*Cooke's Third Voyage*, B. 2. c. 8.

In the Temple Kurumado, in a corner to the left, within a large wooden grate, we took notice of a sexangular lanthorn covered with black gauze, which could be turned round like a wheel, and is said to be of great service in discovering unknown and future things. We were told likewise that a large book of their gods and religion lay in the same lanthorn, of the contents whereof they would or could give us no particulars, and only would make us believe that it was a very strange and miraculous thing.—*Kampher, Japan*, Vol. ii. p. 600.

The conjuror fills a pewter bason or a brass pan full of water, then sets up a stick on each side, from the tops of the sticks he stretches a small cord, and from the centre of that cord suspends a grain of pepper by a thread just to touch, but not in the water: he then dips his fingers in the water and flirts them in the culprit's face; if he is guilty, a white film immediately covers his eyes, which deprives him of sight, and causes most excruciating pain; but if he is innocent, it has no effect. After the guilty person has made his confession, the conjuror departs.—*History of Sierra Leone*.

Before the Sumatrans go to war, they kill a buffalo, or a fowl that is perfectly white, and by observing the motion of the intestines, they judge of the good or ill fortune that will attend them. The priest who performs this ceremony had need to be infallible; for if he predicts contrary to the event, he is sometimes put to death for his want of skill.—*Marsden's Sumatra*.

In the Rudhiradhya-ya, or sanguinary chapter, translated from the Calica Puran, there are a variety of curious omens explained according to the direction in which the head of a human victim, buffalo, &c. falls when severed from the body.—*Asiatic Researches*. Vol. V.

The Scythians have amongst them a great number who practise the art of divination. For this purpose they use a number of willow twigs in this manner: They bring large bundles of them together, and having untied them, dispose them one by one on the ground, each bundle at a distance from the rest. This done, they pretend to foretell the future, during which they take up the bundles separately, and tie them together again. They take also the leaves of the lime-tree, which, dividing into three parts, they twine round their fingers; they then unbind it, and exercise the art to which they pretend.—*Herodot.* B. 4.

The inhabitants of the Pelew islands entertained so strong an idea of divination, that whenever any matter of moment was going to be undertaken, they conceived they could, by splitting the leaves of a particular plant that was not unlike our bulrush, and measuring the strips of this long narrow leaf on the back of their middle finger, form a judgment whether it would or would not turn out prosperous. It was noticed by several of our people that the king resorted to this supposed oracle, on different occasions, particularly at the time they went on the second expedition against Artingall, when he appeared to be very unwilling to go aboard his canoe, and kept all his attendants waiting till he had tumbled and twisted his leaves into a form that satisfied his mind and predicted success. Our people never observed any person but the king apply to this divination.—*Wilson's Pelew Islands*.

The Afghans pry into futurity by astrological and geomantic calculations, and by all sorts of divination and sortilege. Amongst other modes they form presages from drawing lots, from the position assumed by arrows poured carelessly out of a quiver. I remember a conversation which I had (immediately before Shauh Shooja's great struggle against his competitor in 1809) with one of that prince's Persian Ministers, who told me that he had now good reason to rely with certainty on his master's success. I listened with attention, expecting to hear of a correspondence with some of the great lords of the other party, and I was a good deal surprised to find the minister's confidence arose entirely from the result of some augury from the position of arrows.—*Elphinstone's Account of Cabul*, p. 223.

Mr. John Rawlins, when a prisoner on board a Turkish vessel, thus describes a singular mode of divination by arrows. Upon the sight of two great ships, feared to be two Spanish men-of-war, a deep silence is commanded in the ship; after that all the company give a great shriek; sometimes the sails are all taken in, and perhaps presently after hoisted out again, as the conjuror presages. There are also a cutlass and two arrows laid on a cushion, one for the Turks, the other for the Christians, and a curtaxe: then this wise man reads, and some one or other takes the two arrows in his hand by their heads; if the arrow for the Christians comes over the head of the arrow for the Turks, it foretels they will be taken; if the arrow for the Turks comes over the head of that for the Christians, they think themselves sure of success. The curtaxe is taken up by a child or some person that is a stranger to the matter, and it is much minded if it lie on the same side or no. They observe lunatics too, for the conjuror writes down their sayings in a book, grovelling upon the ground as if he whispered to the devil.—*Harris's Voyages*, p. 371.

TERAPHIM.

MR. EDITOR,—In D'Oyly and Mant's Bible, the latter note upon the word *idols* (אֱתֵרֶפִּים), Gen. xxxi. 19, is "The Teraphim were probably the pictures or statues of some of Rachel's ancestors, and taken by her for the preservation of their memory, when she was about never to return to her country and father's house again. Laban had abused them to idolatry."—*Dr. Lightfoot*. But perhaps she did it rather to wean her father from his idolatrous habits, and to prevent him from discovering the road she had taken, if we suppose them to have been the receptacles of evil spirits, and kept for the purpose of divination, which the Syriac word ܐܝܕܝܐ, *inquirens*, implies.

Laban, in the 29th verse, speaking to Jacob, calls the God of Abraham by the name אֱלֹהֵי, and, in the verse following, calls his own Teraphim by the same name; which is certainly very natural, supposing him to have been an idolater. Jacob, in the 32d verse, bids him search for his Teraphim, calling them, doubtless from a sense of his own innocence, by the same name אֱלֹהֵי; but, in the 37th verse, he asks him, in seeming derision and contempt, whether among all his furniture he had found any of his household utensils, not repeating the before-mentioned word אֱלֹהֵי, but כֵּלֵי בֵּיתֶךָ.

That these Teraphim, εἰδωλα, were a kind of images or busts, answering to the *Lares* or household gods of the Romans, seems very probable. The Sanscrit टार, *tara*, a house, and प, *pa*, to protect, denote the Teraphim to be a species of inferior idols, kept and worshipped under the idea of the protection they afforded to the house, and consequently rank the cognate Teraphim among the *Lares* or *Dii familiares*, and not among the *Penates*; which, according to Livy, were idols of a distinct order from the *Lares*; the latter were of human, the former of divine origin. The תֵּרָפִים were, as Rabbi D. Kimchi says, "fictas ab Astrologis ut futura prædicerent, et humana forma factas, ita ut cœlestis influentiæ essent capaces." In Ezekiel xxi. 26, we find the king of Babylon consulting them; "he made his

arrows bright, he consulted בִּתְרָפִים, he looked into the liver." And Juvenal thus describes the Lares—

graciles ubi parva coronas
Accipiunt fragili simulachra nitentia cera.
Hic nostrum placabo Jovem, Laribusque paternis
Thura dabo, atque omnes violæ jactabo colores. Sat. XII. 87.

Horace, Od. B. 3. O. 23, gives to the Lares another property, viz. that of rendering fruitful their fields and herds, and prospering all their undertakings; and with this sense agree the Arabic and Æthiopic. Arabic, رَبِّ, bonis commodisque vitæ affluxit, vel iis fructus et lætatus fuit. Æth. ተራረ, abundare. Luke xv. 17.

אֲנִי: פִּתְצָאָה: אֲנִי: אֲנִי: qui abundant pane. Whatever, therefore, was the use made of the Roman Lares, we may reasonably suppose the same to have been made of the Teraphim of Laban; and that, in fact, they were the same kind of idols. Neither can I find that the תְּרָפִים were intended to represent an image of Jehovah, for Jacob afterwards, in Gen. xxxv. 4, calls them אֱלֹהֵי הַנֹּכַח, all the strange, or foreign, or unknown gods. See all the places where Teraphim are mentioned—Gen. xxxi., Zach. x., Ezek. xxi., Hosea iii., Judges xvii. xviii., 2 Kings xxiii., 1 Sam. xv. xix.

The Penates seem to correspond with the שֶׁרָפִים, Seraphim, and probably the כִּרְבִּיּוֹת, Cherubim: and here I cannot help observing, that the most satisfactory meaning of numberless words in the Old Testament seems to be preserved in the Sanscrit as well as the Arabic language;—e. g. Seraphim; Sans. सार best, and पा to protect,—

Ar. شرف, nobilitate ac gloria vicit, denoting them to be powerful and glorious protectors. Cherubim; Sans. चारु, beautiful, and वा as; a particle of assimilation, denoting, perhaps, their similitude to the Seraphim. Consult the following texts:—for Seraphim, Isaiah vi. compared with Rev. iv.; for Cherubim, Gen. iii., Exod. xxv. xxxvi., 1 Kings vi., Ezek. x., 2 Sam. xxii.

I shall, however, be much gratified if any of your correspondents may feel inclined to enlarge upon and further elucidate this subject.

I am, Mr. Editor, your humble Servant,

B. CLERICUS..

BURNING OF HERETICS.

LE STEPHANAIS (a French paper published at St. Etienne) of the 8th ult. contains a long account of a sermon then recently preached by a young ecclesiastic, in defence of the Inquisition, the establishment of which in France he strongly recommended, advocating the justice and legality of burning heretics on grounds somewhat differing from the majority of its old defenders, who for the most part represent it as a dispensation of mercy to the soul of the individual at the expense of his body. The line of argument followed on the present occasion was, that "as the civil law punishes with death the assassin who merely kills the body, a still greater punishment, if possible, should be awarded to him who murders the soul." What a piece of work is man when fanaticism once lays hold of him!

LAW REPORT.

UPON THE POWER OF OFFICIATING MINISTERS TO DIRECT THE MANNER IN WHICH SINGING SHALL BE CONDUCTED IN PARISH CHURCHES.

WE have received several communications from valued correspondents upon the state of the law upon this subject. And as there appears to be different opinions entertained upon the point, we are induced from this circumstance, and also from a consciousness of its importance, to give, at length, the luminous and elaborate judgment of Lord Stowell in the case of *Hutchins v. Denziloe*, reported in the first volume of Dr. Haggard's Consistory Reports, in which the law upon this subject is fully stated and perspicuously explained. The following is a copy of such parts of the case, taken from the above reports, as relate to the point.

"The office of the Judge promoted by HUTCHINS v. DENZILOE and LOVELAND.

"This was a proceeding against the Churchwardens of the parish of St. Botolph, Aldersgate, at the promotion of the Rev. John Hutchins, officiating and licensed curate of the said parish, by articles; and the offence was thus stated in the citation: 'More especially for obstructing and prohibiting, by your own pretended power and authority, and declaring your resolution to continue to obstruct and prohibit, the singing or chanting by the parish clerk and children of the ward, and congregation, accompanied by the organ.'

"On the part of the Churchwardens, it appears to have been supposed, that, as they paid the organist and managed the children, they were to direct when the organ should or should not play, and when the children should or should not chant. The clergyman had ordered the playing and singing at certain parts of the service.—The Churchwardens forbade both.

JUDGMENT.

"Sir William Scott.—This is a proceeding by articles against the Churchwardens of St. Botolph, Aldersgate, the nature of which has been fully set forth."

"The real question in the case is, whether the fact charged is of a criminal nature? The charge is that of having obstructed a practice approved of by the inhabitants and by the Bishop. These are the material averments,—for the statement, that it had been done by the approbation of former Churchwardens, is of little effect, as that could not in this instance operate as a rule to their successors.

"The first point is, whether these Churchwardens have a right to interfere in the service of the Church? as if that interference is legal in any case, it is so in the present. To ascertain this, it is proper to consider what are their duties: and I conceive, that originally they were confined to the care of the ecclesiastical property of the parish, over which they exercise a discretionary power for specific purposes. In all other respects, it is an office of observation and complaint, but not of control, with respect to divine worship; so it is laid down in Ayliffe,* in one of the best dissertations on the duties of Churchwardens; and in the canons of 1571.† In these it is observed, that Churchwardens are appointed to provide the furniture of the Church, the bread and wine for the holy sacrament, the surplice, and the books necessary for the performance of divine worship, and such as are directed by law; but it is the Minister who has the *use*. If, indeed, he errs in this respect, it is just matter of complaint, which the Churchwardens are obliged to attend to; but the law would not oblige them to complain, if they had a power in themselves to redress the abuse.

"In the service, the Churchwardens have nothing to do, but to collect the alms at the offertory; and they may refuse the admission of strange preachers into the pulpit. For this purpose they are authorized by the canon,‡ but *how*? When letters of Orders are produced, their authority ceases.

* Parergon, p. 170. † c. 5. ‡ 1603. c. 50.

Again, if the minister introduces any irregularity into the service, they have no authority to interfere, but they may complain to the Ordinary of his conduct. I do not say there may not be cases, where they may be bound to interpose; in such cases, they may repress, and ought to repress, all indecent interruptions of the service by others, and are the most proper persons to repress them, and they desert their duty if they do not. And if a case could be imagined, in which even a preacher himself was guilty of any act grossly offensive, either from natural infirmity or from disorderly habits, I will not say that the Churchwardens, and even private persons, might not interpose to preserve the decorum of public worship. But that is a case of instant and overbearing necessity, and that supersedes all ordinary rules. In cases which fall short of such a singular pressure, and can await the remedy of a proper legal complaint, that is the only proper mode to be pursued by a Churchwarden,—if private and decent application to the minister himself shall have failed in preventing what he deems the repetition of an irregularity. At the same time, it is at his own peril if he makes a public complaint, or even a private complaint, in an offensive manner, of that which is no irregularity at all, and is in truth nothing more than a misinterpretation of his own. I shall pass over a case which has been cited from the State Trials;* as it was one of party heat, that took place in times of party ferment, and is of smaller authority on that account.

"I am next to consider whether the Churchwardens, if having authority, have interposed in this case to hinder

an illegal or legal act? And in this branch of the question I dismiss all consideration of expediency, which is in the Ordinary himself alone,—the court judges only of the legality. Has then the Bishop a discretion upon this subject? Those who have undertaken to shew that he has not, must shew a prohibition which restrains it; and in order to establish *this*, it is said, that though singing part of the Psalms is properly practised in Cathedrals, it is not so in Parish Churches. No law has been adduced to this effect, but modern usage alone has been relied on; and it is said that such has been the practice from the time of the Reformation. This, however, is not supported by any particular statement of fact or authority.

"In the primitive churches, the favourite practice of the Christians to sing hymns in *alternate verses*, is expressly mentioned by Pliny, in one of his epistles to the emperor Trajan.* The Church of Rome afterwards refined upon this practice;—as it was their policy to make their ministers considerable in the eyes of the common people; and one way of effecting *that*, was by appointing them sole officers in the public service of the church; and difficult music was introduced, which no one could execute without a regular education of that species. At the Reformation this was one of the grievances complained of by the laity; and it became the distinguishing mark of the Reformers, to use plain music, in opposition to the complex musical service of the Catholics. The Lutheran Church, to which the Church of England has more conformed in discipline, retained a choral service.† The

* Trial at Rochester Assizes, July, 1719, before Sir Lyttleton Powys, vol. 10. app. p. 38. fol. ed. In this case, on a collection for charity, in the church of Chislehurst, the Magistrates interfered, and a scene of violence and confusion ensued. They indicted the clergyman at Rochester Assizes for collecting money without authority. The clergyman, in the mean time, instituted proceedings in the Ecclesiastical Court of Rochester against the persons who interrupted the offices of the church.

* "Affirmabant hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ, vel erroris, quod essent soliti, stato die, ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem."—Ep. tit. 10. 97.

† See the common service of those churches.—*The agreement of the Lutheran Churches with the Church of England* was set forth in a tract under that title, in 1715; in which it is said, "It might indeed have been shewn further; the agreement of the Lutheran Churches with ours, in the manner of celebrating the public worship,—that they agree with us in using a Liturgy,

Calvinistic Churches, of which it has sometimes been harshly and untruly said, 'that they think to find religion wherever they do not find the Church of Rome,' have discarded it entirely, with a strong attachment to plain congregational melody,—and that perhaps not always of the most harmonious kind.

"The reformation of the Church of England, which was conducted by authority, as all reformations should be, if possible, and not merely by popular impulse, retained the choral service in cathedrals and collegiate chapels. There are certainly, in modern usage, two services to be distinguished; one the cathedral service, which is performed by persons who are in a certain degree professors of music, in which others can join only by ear; the other, in which the service is performed in a plain way, and in which all the congregation nearly take an equal part. It has been argued, that nothing beyond this ought to be permitted in ordinary parochial service; it being that which general usage at the present day alone permits. But that carries the distinction further than the law will support—for, if inquiries go further back, to periods more nearly approaching the Reformation, there will be found authority sufficient, in point of law and practice, to support the use of more music even in a parish church or chapel.

"The first Liturgy was established in the time of Edward VI. in 1548. This was followed, after a lapse of four years, by a second, which was published in the reign of the same king, in 1552; and the third, which is in use at present, agreeing in substance with the former, as ordained and promulged 1 Eliz. in 1559.

"It is observable that these statutes of Edward VI., which continue in force, describe even-service as even-song. This is adopted into the statute of the first of Elizabeth. The Liturgy

in singing of Anthems, &c. But it is not necessary." p. 10.

The above tract appears to have been written to obviate any public prejudice against the illustrious House of Hanover, on account of King George the First being a Lutheran.

also of Edward VI. describes the *singing or saying of even-song*; and in the communion service, the Minister is directed to *sing* one or more of the sentences at the Offertory. The same with regard to the Litany; *that is appointed to be sung*. In the present Liturgy, the Psalter is printed with directions that it should *be said or sung*, without any distinction of parish churches, or others; and the Rubric also describes the Apostles' Creed '*to be sung or said by the Minister and people*,' not by the Prebendaries, Canons, and a band of regular choristers, as in cathedrals; but plainly referring to the service of a parish church. Again, in the burial service:—part is *to be sung by the minister and people*; so also in the Athanasian and Nicene Creeds.

The injunctions that were published in 1559 by Queen Elizabeth,* com-

* "For the encouragement of the art, and the continuance of the use of singing in the Church of England, it is enjoined, That because in divers collegiate, as also in some parish churches, heretofore there hath been livings appointed for the maintenance of men and children for singing in the church, by means whereof the laudable exercise of music hath been had in estimation, and preserved in knowledge: The Queen's Majesty, neither meaning in anywise the decay of any thing that might conveniently tend to the use and continuance of the said science, neither to have the same so abused in any part of the church, that thereby the Common Prayer should be the worse understood by the hearers, willeth and commandeth, that, first, no alterations be made of such assignments of livings, as hath heretofore been appointed to the use of singing or music in the church; but that the same so remain; and that there be a modest and distinct song, so used in all parts of the Common Prayers in the church, that the same may be as plainly understood as if it were without singing; and yet nevertheless, for the comfort of such as delight in music, it may be permitted, that in the beginning or in the end of Common Prayer, either at morning or evening, there may be sung an hymn, or such like song to the praise of Almighty God, in the best melody and music that may be conveniently devised, having respect that the sentence of the hymn may be understood and perceived." Vid. also *Reformatio Legum Eccl.* p. 85. s. 5.

pletely sanction "the continuance of singing in the church," distinguishing between the music adapted for cathedral and collegiate churches, and parochial churches; also in the Articles, for the administration of Prayer and Sacraments set forth in the further injunctions of the same queen, in 1564, the Common Prayer is directed 'to be said or sung decently and distinctly, in such place as the Ordinary shall think meet, for the largeness and straitness of the church and choir, so that the people may be most edified.*' If, then, chanting was unlawful any where but in cathedrals and colleges, these canons are strangely worded, and are of disputable meaning. But in order to shew that they are not liable to such imputation, I shall justify my interpretation of them by a quotation from the "*Reformatio Legum*," a work of great authority in determining the practice of those times, whatever may be its correctness in matter of law. With respect to parish churches in cities, it is there observed, "*eadem parochiarum in urbibus constitutarum erit omnis ratio, festis et dominicis diebus, quæ prius collegiis et cathedralibus ecclesiis, (ut vocant) attributa fuit.*"† The metrical version of the Psalms was then not existing, the first publication not taking place till 1562, and it was not regularly annexed to the book of Common Prayer till 1576, after which those Psalms soon became the great favourites of the common people.‡ The introduction of this

version made the ancient hymns disrelished; but it cannot be meant that they were entirely superseded; for, under the statutes of the Reformation, and the usage explanatory of them, it is recommended, that the ancient hymns should be used in the Liturgy, or rather that they should be preferred to any others: though certainly to perform them by a select band with complex music, very inartificially applied, as in many of the churches in the country, is a practice not more reconcileable to good taste than to edification. But to sing with plain congregational music is a practice fully authorized, particularly with respect to the concluding part of different portions of the service.

"If it be urged that there is any incongruity in this, I answer, that I have to discuss a question of illegality, not of incongruity. It is true, indeed, that what is obsolete is liable to the objection of novelty, and, likewise, that it has been tried and laid aside. The court would not therefore advise the minister to introduce what may be liable to such remarks, against the inclination of the parishioners, and the approbation of the Bishop. But this is matter of expediency and discretion, which the court must leave to the consideration of others. Having thus declared that the Churchwardens are not entitled to interfere, and that the practice is legal, it may be expected I should admit these articles. I am certainly authorized to do so; but I shall suspend their admission till the first day of next term, recommending an accommodation to the parties, and only intimating that the general sense of the parish, properly obtained, will weigh very much with the court in the further consideration of this subject."

* s. 1.

† c. 6. This work was published in its present form, chiefly under the direction of Walter Haddon, LL.D. Master of the Requests, Judge of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, and Master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge.

‡ "Plain song was retained in most parish churches for the daily psalms; so in the queen's own chapels, and in the choir of all cathedrals and some colleges, the hymns were sung after a more melodious manner, with organs commonly, and sometimes with other musical instruments,

as the solemnity required. No mention of singing David's psalms in metre, though afterwards they first thrust out the hymns, and by degrees also did they the *Te Deum*, *Magnificat*, and the *Nunc dimittis*.—*Heylin on the Reformation*, p. 289.

MONTHLY REGISTER.

BARBADOS SOCIETY FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE POOR IN
THE PRINCIPLES OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH.*Tenth Annual Report.*

ON reviewing the proceedings of the last year, the Committee have discovered no very remarkable occurrence that has taken place.

The Tenth Annual Report, therefore, does not contain an account of any alteration or addition to the buildings of the Central Schools, which are now complete; nor of any improvement as regards the regulations for extending the benefits of the charity by any further reduction of the expenses for boarding, &c., it being impossible to feed, clothe, and educate a child for a less sum than 15*l. currency*,*—the sum which the Committee determined last year to receive (under certain circumstances) for each boarder. In short, the present Report exhibits no striking or attractive novelty; but it is not on that account destitute of interest.

To improve the moral character and condition of the poor whites was the great object which called the Central Schools into existence; and the Committee have the comfort of stating to the Board of Directors, that this object has been steadily kept in view, and they trust, under God's blessing, successfully persevered in.

Deeply impressed with the conviction that this desirable end could only be attained by imparting fully the important doctrines of Christianity to the rising generation, the Committee have laboured to raise the useful superstructure of practical knowledge on the solid basis of religious truth. Accordingly, while the strictest attention is paid to such branches of instruction as are indispensable to qualify the children for discharging the duties of any situation in which it is probable

that they may be placed, habits of regularity and industry are recommended and enforced, and morality is reared on the only firm foundation—religion. The Holy Scriptures, from which every lesson that they read is drawn, are daily in the hands of the children, and thus the whole counsel of God is declared unto them. That such a system of education must be beneficial to the children in the first instance, and ultimately to all with whom they may have any connexion, cannot be questioned; and from the continued applications (always more numerous than can be met) for apprentices in every trade and occupation, the Committee trust that they are borne out in asserting, that this institution stands as high as ever in the estimation of the public, as schools of sound and useful learning.

In the month of June an application was received by the Committee from the Rev. George Cummins, for the admission of a boy from the island of Trinidad, as a boarder, into the Central School: this boy, named William Young, has been accordingly admitted. The Committee state this fact as one instance of the high opinion which is entertained in the neighbouring colonies respecting the mode of education pursued in the Central Schools of Barbados. And here they bear willing testimony to the ability and unremitting diligence of Mr. Redwar, the master, in performing his laborious duties. The neat appearance and general health of the boys, sufficiently declare that the duties of the matron are discharged with method, care, and kindness. It may be deemed an object of minor consideration, but the Committee would repeat the statement made in the last Reports, that the

* About ten pounds sterling.

boarders on the Establishment for boys, make and mend all their clothes. When it is remembered that this is done at leisure hours, under the superintendence of the matron, the Committee feel that, besides gaining useful knowledge, the children are also accustomed to habits of industry; and a further advantage arising from it, is a considerable reduction in the expenses of the institution.

The total number of boys on the institution is 120; of these, 42 are boarders, and 78 day-scholars; during the year, 12 boys have left the school, 11 of whom went into employment; the other has returned to his parish.

The Committee are peculiarly anxious to invite the attention of the public to the Girls' Central School. They cannot speak in too high terms of the valuable services of Mrs. Graysfoot, the schoolmistress, who zealously labours to instil into the minds of the children the pure precepts of morality, as inculcated in the Gospel, while, with equal diligence, she endeavours to train them to useful habits. They assist in many domestic occupations, by which there is a saving in expense; and a further advantage arises from their being thus, in some measure, prepared for business when they quit the school. Besides making all the clothes which they wear, the profits arising from their needle-work, since the last Report, amounts to 46*l*. 7*s*. 8½*d*. Of this sum, 10*l*. were laid out in rewards, which were distributed to the most deserving children. At present there are on this establishment, 75 children, 59 day-scholars and 16 boarders: four of whom are supported by the charity of individuals. The very moderate expense of 15*l*. currency, for the board, education, and clothing of a child, is surely within the means of many; and the Committee do boldly assert, that no greater good can be done for any destitute girl than to place her on such an establishment; for they enjoy, in addition to the watchful care and excellent instruction of the schoolmistress, the great advantage of being under the superintendence of the Ladies' Committee, who, with ability commensurate to their zeal, continue

to perform the charitable task which they have undertaken. During the last year, 12 girls have left the school, two of whom went immediately into business: the others returned to their parents.

The Committee feel themselves again called to the gratifying duty of recording another instance of the very kind and liberal spirit which has ever actuated the Vestry of St. Michael's towards this Institution from its establishment. They have this year appropriated a larger sum than usual to the clothing of the girls (pensioners of the parish), and placed this sum entirely at the disposal of the Ladies' Committee. The result proves the beneficial effects of cordial co-operation among those who desire to do good. The uniform dress in which the girls now appear in Church, must strike every eye; and owing to the judicious management of the Ladies' Committee, they have this year three complete suits of clothes (precisely the same as the uniform dress alluded to), two pair of shoes, and a straw bonnet, very superior to what they formerly had. The following is an extract from the minutes of the 4th June:—

"The attention of the Committee having been called to the circumstance that the children of the Central Schools did not attend Divine Service during the vacations, the master and mistress were directed to enforce the attendance of the children residing in the parish at these times, and to require from all the boarders a certificate from the respective Rectors of the Country parishes, of their having been regular at Church. The master and mistress were further authorized to provide a dinner from the general funds for those attending at St. Michael's."

"The Book-binding establishment continues to advance, and Edwards, the boy alluded to in the last Report, produces specimens that are very creditable to him, considering the few advantages he has had of learning the business. The Committee have resolved to allow him 20*l*. per cent. on the amount received for the work done by him from January 1st, 1828.

Rowe, the youth who was formerly Assistant in the School, has been ap-

pointed by the Bishop during the last year to take the charge of a School for coloured children, in the Bay, and is conducting it very successfully. Another boy educated in the Central School, by the name of Fields, having been recommended by the master, and approved of by the Committee, has succeeded to Rowe's place.

The Committee have to acknowledge with thankfulness, the legacy of 100*l.*, which was bequeathed to this Institution during this year by the late Dr. Innes.

The Committee with the deepest regret advert to the loss which this Institution has sustained in the death of Dr. Richards. His zealous exertions in behalf of the Central-Schools, will ever be remembered by all who have the interests of the charity at heart. Whether he be regarded as a member of the Committee consulting for the general good of the Institution, or in his professional character in which

he always gave his advice and attention to the Children in illness, his services cannot be too highly appreciated, nor too gratefully remembered.

In closing their Report, the Committee do most earnestly recommend the Central Schools to their countrymen, as having a strong claim on their liberality. If it be desirable that ignorance, idleness and vice be eradicated from the minds of the lower orders, and that truth, industry, and virtue be planted in their stead, then may the Committee stand forth and confidently solicit support for an Institution in which knowledge—useful, practical, religious knowledge—is disseminated. Uniform success cannot be expected; and the beneficial influence of such instruction may not, cannot be immediately apparent, but “let us not be weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap if we faint not.”

POLITICAL RETROSPECT.

DOMESTIC.—*The Budget.* The Chancellor of the Exchequer's statement of the revenue for the past year, is as follows:

Estimated Income	£53,900,000
Ditto, Expenditure	50,100,000

Estimated Surplus for the Reduction of the Public Debt	3,800,000
--	-----------

But the real income and expenditure has been—

Income	55,187,000
Expenditure.....	49,336,000
Surplus.....	£5,851,000

being 2,051,000*l.* above that estimated, and which has been chiefly derived from the branches of customs and excise.

He estimates the income and expenditure of the present year, and on the following heads:

Customs and Excise.....	£37,150,000
Stamps.....	7,107,000
Taxes	4,850,000
Post-Office	1,500,000
Incidental	200,000

Total of Estimates of Ordinary Revenue	50,807,000
Extraordinary Items	340,000
	£51,147,000

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE.

Interest of Funded Debt.....	£27,053,000
Ditto, Unfunded Debt	850,000
	<hr/>
	27,903,000
Annuities Payable by the Bank of England	585,000
Charges on Consolidated Fund	2,200,000
	<hr/>
Total of Charges over which Parliament has no direct Control.....	30,688,000
Army Estimates	7,765,172
Navy, ditto	5,878,000
Ordnance, ditto	1,728,000
Miscellaneous	2,067,973
	<hr/>
	£48,127,145

which, deducted from the amount of estimated income, leaves a surplus of 3,019,855*l.* applicable for the reduction of the national debt.

Of the financial measures which he proposes to adopt, one is the funding of three millions of Exchequer Bills in the 4 per cents. at 101*l.* 10*s.* for every sum of 100*l.* in Exchequer Bills guaranteed not to be reduced before 1833.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer admits there is no probability that the commercial prosperity of the current year will equal that of the past; and that the depression of commerce, from which our numerous classes of labourers have so long and so severely suffered, are not likely to be speedily removed. To those who measure the prosperity of the country by its imports and exports, the following efficient statements for the past year will be interesting:

Exports from Great Britain..	£61,000,000
Imports into	43,000,000
	<hr/>
Balance of Trade in favour of this Country.....	18,000,000
	<hr/>
Value of Imports into Ireland	1,500,000
Exports from ditto	750,000
	<hr/>
Balance of Trade against Ire- land	£750,000

The annual grant for the support of the College at Maynooth has been passed through the House of Commons. It had been the general hope and expectation that the government, after enacting that no Jesuit should enter

the united kingdoms, and that no title or authority assumed by the Romish Priests should be considered lawful, would have further discouraged the Popish Clergy, by refusing to give them any longer that pecuniary support which is not extended to any Protestant establishment for the education of its Ministers. This, however, it has not thought proper to do, and being called upon during the debate by some members to declare, that the House would not be called upon to renew the grant after the present year, Lord Leveson Gower replied, that the government would not pledge themselves to withdraw the support so long afforded to this Institution. It may be remembered that Lord Redesdale, during the present Session, stated, in the House of Lords, the evils that have arisen from this College as very great; that, formerly, when the Papal Clergy were constrained to attend foreign Universities, they were necessarily taken from a comparatively superior station to the generality of their flocks, and being chiefly chosen from the junior branches of respectable families, they were in some degree united to the aristocracy of the country, and felt some interest in the maintenance of peace and tranquillity. The establishment of the College of Maynooth opened a door immediately for the admission of the lower classes into the ecclesiastical body; the support bestowed by the government enabled them to receive their education at a trifling expense to themselves, and they are returned to their old friends with just sufficient attainments to appear learned in the eyes of the wholly unlettered, and in a capacity calculated to give them great influence among their former associates, without having acquired any of that general knowledge, or mixed in any society which, by giving general and liberal views of the state of mankind, could teach them the necessity of subduing their own passions, and, consequently, enable them to exercise an effective control over those of others. This, indeed, in the spirit of the term *subdue*, can only be obtained by the study of the Holy Scriptures, a book which, though generally open to the Roman Catholic

Clergy, is confessedly not to be found within the walls of Maynooth. Hence it is that the majority of the Papal Clergy in Ireland are greatly inferior to their ecclesiastical brethren, and are not ashamed to be found fomenting every species of riot and disorganization amongst their miserable flocks, proving themselves to be in very truth blind leaders of the blind.

PENINSULA.—The cruelties of Don Miguel continually increase, and the condition of the unhappy kingdom of Portugal becomes daily more deplorable. Twelve persons of rank have been recently executed at Oporto, condemned for high treason, though the charges brought against them were grounded on actions performed by them six weeks previous to Don Miguel declaring himself King. On a report of Donna Maria's leaving England for Terceira, a vessel has been dispatched to intercept her on the passage. The inhabitants of this place do not express any alarm from the anticipation of the arrival of Don Miguel's expedition for their reduction; they have made great preparations for its reception, and boast that Angra once withstood a three years' siege. The usurping government talk of another armament to be sent out during the summer; but this is known to be rendered impossible from want of funds, it having been obliged to resort to every method, in order to procure adequate means for fitting out the one already dispatched. The poverty experienced by Don Miguel's cabinet has reached to such a height, that a seizure has been made of the money belonging to the public deposit, and the contractors with government have been called upon to advance large sums, which they have declined doing. The French papers speak of an overture of Don Pedro for obtaining the hand of the eldest daughter of the Duke of Orleans, accompanied by an offer of Donna Maria, in marriage to the Duke's eldest son. A Spanish plenipotentiary has taken up his abode in

Lisbon, and had an audience with the Queen Mother at Queluz, but does not assume the character of an ambassador.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY.—The campaign in the East has been begun by an attack made by Hussein Pacha on the Russians near Bourgos, but after some severe fighting was compelled to retire with considerable loss. It is quite clear that the Turks have prepared themselves to act on the offensive, and the Sultan has announced his intention of taking the field in person with the army destined to protect Shoumla. Large reinforcements have arrived in that fortress, bringing with them ample stores of every article necessary for its defence in case the Russians should again penetrate to its walls. The Porte computes that it had in the field last year a force of 150,000 effective troops; at the approach of winter the irregulars returned home, as is the customary practice in Oriental armies. These are now returning to their post: for the last three months troops have been arriving at Constantinople, and marched forward immediately to join the main body of the forces lying encamped at Adrianople, previous to their dispersion through the different scenes of action. Bosnia has besides resolved to send its contingent of men this year, which it refused to furnish during the preceding one, and the Divan reckon on bringing into the field an army twice as numerous as in 1828. The fears of a famine at Constantinople are completely dispelled, and the emigration of the Jews and Turks has consequently ceased. The blockade of the Dardanelles has not hindered English speculators from passing through with supplies of corn; and a new order of the Government having abolished the monopoly of the corn trade, which has hitherto subsisted, it is hoped that this measure will check the spirit of usury, and that many concealed stores will be brought to light.

ECCLESIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE.

CLERICAL APPOINTMENTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Appointment.</i>
Bower, M.	Chapl. of Wilton Gaol.
Cooke, Joseph	Head Mast. of Newark Grammar School.
Cornish, H. K.	Dom. Chapl. to Dowager Baroness Audley.
Hopwood, William	Mast. of Hitchin Grammar School.
La Trobe, J. A.	Dom. Chapl. to Lord Mount Sandford.
Matthew, E.	Readership of St. James's, Bury.
Morgan, C. A.	Chapl. in Ordinary to the King.
Roberson, W. H. M.	Chapl. of Oxford City Gaol.
Shillibeer, John	Head Mast. of Oundle Grammar School.
West, M.	Chapl. of Bury Gaol.
Williams, C. K.	Mast. of Lewes Grammar School.

PREFERMENTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Preferment.</i>	<i>County.</i>	<i>Diocese.</i>	<i>Patron.</i>
Bouverie, W. A. ..	West Titherley, R.	Hants	Winchest.	C. B. Wall, Esq.
Bullock, Thomas ..	Castle Eaton, R.	Wilts	Salisbury	T. Culley, Esq.
Cooke, Thomas ..	Grafton Underwood, R.	Northam.	Peterboro'	The Ladies Fitzpatrick
Griffin, John.	Bradley, R.	Hants.	Winchest.	E. B. Blackburn, Esq.
Halliday, E. T. ..	Broomfield, P. C.	Somerset	Bath & W.	{ Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Ross
Harbin, E.	{ R. of Kingsweston to East Lydford, R.	{ Somers.	Bath & W.	{ W. Dickenson, Esq. John Davis, Esq.
Hare, A. W.	Alton Barnes, R.	Wilts	Salisbury	New Coll. Oxford
Harvey, Richard ..	Hornsey, R.	Middlesex	London	Bishop of London
Hodson, George. .	Chr. Ch. Birmingham, P. C.	{	Stafford	{ Lichf. Bp. of Lichf. & Cov.
	and Colwich, V.			
	with Frodswell, C.			
	and St. Katharine Cree, V.			
Ives, William	to Archd. of Stafford	{	Middlesex	London
	& Canon Residentiaryship			
Jones, Calvert R. .	Haltwhistle, V.	Northum.	Durham	Bishop of Durham
Moule, M.	Fordington, V.	{	Dorset	{ Pec. D. & C. } Pr. of Fordington
	with Writhlington, R.			
	Whaddon, V.			
Risley, W. Cotton {	with Nash, Ch.	{ Bucks	Lincoln	New Coll. Oxford
Smith, John	Great Dunmow, V.	Essex	London	Bishop of London
Smyth, T. Scott ..	Preb. in Cath. Ch. of	Exeter		Bishop of Exeter
Strong, T. Linwood {	R. of St. Michael,	{	Middlesex	London
	and Trinity, Queenhithe			
	to Sedgfield, R.			
Warre, F. D. C. L. {	Preb. of Combe 14th in Cath. Ch. of	{	Durham	Durham
	& R. of Cheddon Fitz-paine			
	to Hemiock, R.	Somerset	Bath & W.	Mrs. Warre
		Devon	Exeter	Lieut. Gen. Popham

CLERGYMEN DECEASED.

Best, George	Archdeaconry of New Brunswick			
Evans, David	Simonburn, R.	Northum.	Durham	Greenwich Hospital
	Saddington, R.	Leicester	Lincoln	Lord Chancellor
Haden, A. B.	and Wednesbury, V.	{	Stafford	Lichf. { Lord Chancellor R. of Mucklestone
	and Were, C.			

Name.	Preferment.	County.	Diocese.	Patron.
Heberden, George	Dartford, V.	Kent	Rochester	Bishop of Rochester
Kent, George	Horsford, V.	Norfolk	Norwich	Lord Ranelagh
Palmer, John	{ Fordington, V. with Writhlington, R.	{ Dorset	{ Pec. D. & C. of Salish.	{ Pr. of Fordington in C. C. of Salish.
Polson, J. H. P.	{ Prebend in Cath. Ch. of St. Mary Major, Exeter, R. and Upton Helion, R.	{ Exeter Devon	Exeter	{ Bishop of Exeter D. & C. of Exeter Joseph Polson, Esq.
Richardson, A. D. D.	Great Dunmow, V.	Essex	London	Bishop of London
Salter, Philip	Shenfield, R.	Essex	London	Countess de Grey
Scott, William	Aldridge, R.	Stafford	Lichfield	Sir E. D. Scott, Bart.
Sheppard, Charles	Hornsey, R.	Middlesex	London	Bishop of London
Tavel, G. F.	{ Campsey Ash, R. and Barnham, R. with Euston, R.	{ Suffolk	Norwich	Sir J. Woodford, Bt. Duke of Grafton

Name.	Residence.	County.
Breynton, J. H.	Clifton	Gloucester
Buckham, P. W.	Oundle	Northampton
Bussell, W.	Henley-upon-Thames	Oxford
Keysall, C. W.	Breedon	Worcester
Luxmore, C. C.	Tavistock	Devon
Witham, George	Durham	Durham

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

OXFORD.

ELECTIONS.

The Proctors for the ensuing year have been admitted by the Vice-Chancellor.

Senior Proctor.—The Rev. James Thomas Round, M.A. Fellow of Balliol College, presented by the Rev. Dr. Jenkins, Master of Balliol College.

Junior Proctor.—The Rev. Robert Alder Thorp, M.A. Fellow of Corpus Christi College, presented by the Rev. Dr. Bridges, President of Corpus Christi College.

The Pro-Proctors respectively nominated are:—By Mr. Round—the Rev. George Fuller Thomas, M.A. Worcester College, and the Rev. John Mitchell Chapman, M.A. Fellow of Balliol College. By Mr. Thorp—The Rev. William Glaister, M.A. Fellow of University College, and the Rev. John William Hughes, M.A. Trinity College.

The nominations of the Rev. Renn Dickson Hampden, M.A. late Fellow of Oriel, and the Rev. John Carr, M.A. Fellow of Balliol, as Public Examiners in *Literis Humanioribus*, and of the Rev. Augustus Page Saunders, M.A. Student of Christ Church, as Public Examiner in *Disciplinis Mathematicis et Physicis*, have been finally approved in Convocation.

The nomination of the Rev. Ashhurst

Turner Gilbert, D. D. Principal of Brasen-nose, to be a Perpetual Delegate of Privileges has been approved in Convocation.

Richard Michell, Esq. M.A. of Wadham College, has been nominated a Public Examiner in *Literis Humanioribus*.

The Rev. Charles Kevern Williams, M.A. Fellow of Pembroke College, has been nominated a Public Examiner in *Disciplinis Mathematicis et Physicis*.

The Rev. John Collier Jones, D. D. Rector of Exeter College, and Vice-Chancellor of the University, has been elected Curator of the Sheldonian Theatre, in the room of the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, resigned.

The Electors appointed to decide on the respective merits of the candidates for the three Craven Scholarships, lately vacated by lapse of time, have declared their choice to fall on the following gentlemen:—

William Henry Johnson, Commoner of Worcester College, as of kin to the Founder. John Thomas, Commoner of Wadham College.

Frederick Rogers, Commoner of Oriel College.

The Rev. Henry Soames, M.A. of Wadham College, has been appointed by the Heads of Colleges to preach the Bampton Lecture Sermons for the year 1830.

DEGREES CONFERRED.

DOCTORS IN DIVINITY.

Rev. James Webber, Christ Church, Dean of Ripon, and Prebendary of Westminster, grand compounder.
Charles T. Longley, late Stud. of Chr. Ch.

DOCTOR IN CIVIL LAW.

J. W. Buller, late Fell. of All Souls' Coll.

BACHELORS IN DIVINITY.

Rev. Charles Thomas Longley, late Student of Christ Church, now Head Master of Harrow School.
Rev. C. Dethick Blyth, Fell. St. John's Coll.
Rev. W. A. Bouverie, Fell. of Merton Coll.
Rev. C. L. Swainson, Fell. St. John's Coll.
Rev. Herbert White, Fell. Corpus Chr. Coll.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Thomas Ogier Ward, Queen's Coll.
Rev. H. J. Buckoll, Michel Schol. Queen's Coll.
Rev. E. Girdlestone, Scholar of Balliol Coll.
Rev. Thomas Peach Holdich, Balliol Coll.
David Scott Meikleham, Balliol Coll.
Hon. J. Chetwynd Talbot, Stud. Chr. Ch.
Rev. W. Dann Harrison, Worcester Coll.
Rev. Horace Chavasse, Worcester Coll.
Rev. R. Barton Robinson, Queen's Coll.
Rev. Henry Demain, Queen's Coll.
Rev. William Orger, St. Edmund Hall.
Hon. Lloyd Kenyon, Christ Church.
Rev. P. Hansell, Scholar of University Coll.
Rev. Chas. Stone, Scholar of University Coll.
Rev. William Ives, Balliol Coll.
Rev. William Blundell, Brasenose Coll.
Robert Price Morrell, Fell. Magdalen Coll.
Rev. James Peter Rhoades, Wadham Coll.
Henry Jas. Louis Williams, Magdalen Hall.
Rev. John Simon Jenkinson, Magdalen Hall.
Henry John Hutton, Magdalen Hall.
Thomas Brown, Magdalen Hall.
Rev. W. Cartwright Kitson, Worcester Coll.
Rev. J. Hadley, Scholar of Worcester Coll.
George Clive, Brasenose Coll.
William Rhodes Bernard, Balliol Coll.
Rev. J. Jenkins, Merton Coll. grand. comp.
Rev. W. Lockwood, Univ. Coll. grand. comp.
Thos. Percy Meade, Fell. of All Souls' Coll.
Rev. Richard Brickdale, Christ Church.
Rev. Henry Oldershaw, Brasenose Coll.
Fretchville Lawson B. Dykes, Oriel Coll.
Rev. Henry Richards, Magdalen Hall.

ELECTIONS.

The Rev. Robert Willis, M. A. Junior Fellow of Caius College, has been elected a Senior Fellow; Joseph Henry Jerrard, B. A. a Frankland Fellow, and Robert Murphy, B. A. a Perse Fellow of that Society.

The Rev. Alexander Henry Small, M. A. has been admitted a Fellow on the foun-

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Christopher Alderson, Magdalen Hall.
Marmaduke Robert Jeffreys, Christ Church.
Joseph Bonsor, Exeter Coll.
Robert Armitage, Worcester Coll.
John Richard F. Billingsley, Lincoln Coll.
Laurence Armistead, Lincoln Coll.
George Bellamy, Lincoln Coll.
John Cobbold Aldrich, Lincoln Coll.
Andrew Douglas Stacpoole, Fell. New Coll.
Robert James Mackintosh, Fell. New Coll.
Wm. George Duncombe, Brasenose Coll.
Wm. Wilbraham Johnson, Brasenose Coll.
James Armistead, Wadham Coll.
Charles Dowding, Queen's Coll.
George Weare Bush, Queen's Coll.
John Dinning, Queen's Coll.
Rev. Arthur Bromiley, St. Edmund Hall.
Chas. Egerton Dukinfield, Magdalen Hall.
Charles Kyd Bishop, Magdalen Hall.
William Brown Clark, University Coll.
George Herbert Cotton, Worcester Coll.
John Clervaux Chaytor, Worcester Coll.
William Wilcox Clarke, Wadham Coll.
William York Draper, Wadham Coll.
Edward Thomas, Wadham Coll.
Charles John Birch, Fell. of St. John's Coll.
John Garratt Bussell, Trinity Coll.
Sir John T. B. Duckworth, Oriel Coll.
Harris Jervoise Bigg Wither, Oriel Coll.
David Vavasor Durell, Christ Church, incorporated from Trinity Coll. Cambridge, grand compounder.
William Fisher, St. Edmund Hall.
Richard Fawcett, Lincoln Coll.
John Swainson, Brasenose Coll.

MARRIED.

The Rev. Edward Cardwell, B.D. Fellow of Brasenose College, Camden Professor of Ancient History, and Rector of Stoke Bruern, Northamptonshire, to Cecilia, youngest daughter of the late Henry Feilden, Esq. of Wotton House, Lancashire.

Rev. W. Spencer Phillips, B.D. Fellow and late Tutor of Trinity College, and Minister of St. John's Church, Cheltenham, to Penelope, youngest daughter of the late Commodore Broughton, and niece of Sir John Delves Broughton, Bart. of Doddington Hall, in the county of Chester.

CAMBRIDGE.

date of Sir Wolston Dixie, at Emmanuel College.

William Royde Colbeck, B. A. Scholar of Emmanuel College, has been elected a Fellow of that Society.

John Tinkler, George King, and James Goodwin, Bachelors of Arts, of Corpus Christi College, have been elected Fellows of that Society.

The following gentlemen of Trinity College have been elected Scholars of that Society :

Carey	Burcham	Spedding
Tate	Walker	Tennant
Myers	Wilkinson	Kennedy
Mann	Meller	—
Taylor	Dashwood	<i>Westm. Schol.</i>
Quayle	Chatfield	Dyott
Ponsonby	Worlegde	Allen

Tyrwhitt's Hebrew Scholarships.—The following gentlemen have been elected Scholars upon this foundation:—

FIRST CLASS.

Rev. Wm. Dodd, B. A. Corp. Chr. Coll. }
James Gorle, B. A. Clare Hall. }

SECOND CLASS.

W. B. A. Raven, B. A. Trinity Coll.

GRACES

to the following effect have passed the Senate:—

To appoint Mr. Dawes of Downing College, and Mr. Green of Jesus College, Pro-Rectors for the remainder of the year.

To appoint the Vice-Chancellor, the Bishop of Lincoln, the Master of Catharine Hall, Professor Haviland, Professor Whewell, Mr. Carrigan of St. John's College, Mr. Hustler of Jesus College, Mr. Peacock of Trinity College, Mr. Sheldford of Corpus Christi College, Mr. Lodge of Magdalene College, and Mr. King of Queen's College, a Syndicate to consider of the arrangements to be made concerning the "Old Court" lately purchased of King's College.

PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

At the anniversary meeting, the following officers were elected for the ensuing year:—

The Rev. Dr. Turton, President.	
The Rev. Prof. Farish,	} Vice-Pres.
The Rev. Prof. Sedgwick,	
The Rev. Temple Chevallier,	
Dr. F. Thackeray, Treasurer	
The Rev. Prof. Henslow, re-elected	} Sec.
The Rev. Prof. Whewell, re-elected	
The Rev. J. Lodge, re-elected, Steward of the Reading-Room.	

COUNCIL.

Dr. Haviland,	
The Rev. H. Coddington,	} Old Members.
The Rev. W. Maddy,	
The Rev. H. Farish,	

The Rev. W. L. P. Garnons, }
The Rev. J. Bowstead, } New Members.
The Rev. R. Willis, }

DEGREES CONFERRED.

DOCTOR IN DIVINITY.

The Rev. Joseph Allen, Trinity Coll.
Prebendary of Westminster

BACHELORS IN DIVINITY.

Rev. James Blomfield, Emmanuel Coll.
Rev. Charles Wesley, Christ Coll. Alternate
Minister of St. Mary's Chapel, Fulham.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Henry Ashington, Trinity Coll.
Howard Elphinstone, Trinity Coll.
William Keeling, Fell. of St. John's Coll.
W. Hallows Miller, Fell. of St. John's Coll.
Rev. Henry Wm. Crick, Jesus Coll.
Henry Alexander Brown, Christ Coll.
Thomas Kenyon, Christ Coll. (Comp.)
Rev. A. H. Small, Fell. of Emmanuel Coll.

BACHELOR IN CIVIL LAW.

Rev. Paul Ashmore, Christ Coll.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

George Henry Feachem, Trinity Coll.
Robert Devey, Trinity Coll.
Calmady Pollexfen Hamlyn, Trinity Coll.
Charles Henry Templeton, Trinity Coll.
William Henry Tudor, Trinity Coll.
Thomas Moore, St. John's Coll.
William George Nott, St. John's Coll.
Thomas Storer, St. John's Coll.
Francis J. Courtenay, St. Peter's Coll.
William Ludlow, St. Peter's Coll.
Thomas Moore, St. Peter's Coll.
Horace Pitt Shewell, St. Peter's Coll.
Thornhill Heathcote, Clare Hall
Edward Ethelstone, Pembroke Coll.
Charles Fox Chawner, Corpus Christi Coll.
John Hooper, Corpus Christi Coll.
George William Straton, Corpus Chr. Coll.
James King Went, Corpus Christi Coll.
Richard Bethel Boyes, Queen's Coll.
James Mellor Brown, Queen's Coll.
Joseph Brown, Queen's Coll.
Charles Clark, Queen's Coll.
John Hodgson Steble, Queen's Coll.
Richard Taylor, Queen's Coll.
Bryan S. Broughton, Christ Coll.
James Penfold, Christ Coll.
Allen Allicock Young, Magdalene Coll.
Thomas James Rocke, Downing Coll.

At the same congregation, Dr. Charles R. Elrington, Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin, was admitted D. D. *ad eundem.*

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We beg to inform Mr. Terrett, that his work on the Romans is under review; and that his communication shall be attended to shortly.